J. STALIN

WORKS 16

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

J. V. STALIN

WORKS

VOLUME 16

NOVEMBER 1944 - 1952

EDITED AND PUBLISHED BY
RED STAR PRESS
P.O.BOX 71
LONDON SW 2

-1986-

CONTENTS

ORDER OF THE DAY OF NOVEMBER 29, 1944

Order of the Day, addressed to Marshal Tolbukhin, announces that troops of the Third Ukrainian Front, having gone over to the offensive, have forced the Danube north of the River Drava, broken through the enemy defences on the western bank of the Danube and, advancing to a depth of about 40 kilometres, widened their breakthrough up to 150 kilometres along the front.

During the offensive, troops of the front on the territory of Hungaria, captured the towns and large communications junctions of Pecs, Bataszek and Mohacs, and captured in fighting more than 330 other populated places.

The Order mentions 49 commanders of troops, the Yugoslav Corps, artillerymen, tankmen, airmen, sappers and signallers whose units and formations have distinguished themselves.

A salute of 20 salvoes was fired from 224 Moscow guns.

("Soviet War News Weekly," No.151)

ORDER OF THE DAY OF NOVEMBER 30, 1944

Order of the Day,addressed to Marshal Malinovsky and Col.-Gen. Zakharov, announces that troops of the Second Ukrainian Front, continuing their offensive, on November 30, captured the towns of Eger and Szikszo, district centres of Hungary, large communications junctions and im-

portant strongpoints in the enemy defences.

The Order mentions 21 commanders of troops, artillerymen, tankmen, airmen, sappers and signallers whose units and formations have distinguished themselves.

A salute of 12 salvoes was fired from 124 Moscow guns.

("Soviet War News Weekly," No. 151)

ORDER OF THE DAY OF DECEMBER 2, 1944

Order of the day,addressed to Marshal Tolbukhin and Lt.-Gen. Ivanov, announces that, developing their offensive, troops of the Third Ukrainian Front in two days captured the regional and district centres of Hungary - the towns of Szekszard, Kaposvar, Paks, Bonyhad and Dombovar - large communications junctions and important strongpoints of the enemy defences, and also captured in fighting more than 300 other populated places.

The Order mentions 30 commanders of troops, artillerymen, units and ships of the Danube Naval Flotilla, tankmen, airmen, sappers and signallers whose units and formations have distinguished themselves.

A salute of 20 salvoes was fired from 224 Moscow guns.

("Soviet War News Weekly," No. 151)

ORDER OF THE DAY OF DECEMBER 3, 1944

Order of the Day, addressed to Army-Gen. Petrov and Lt.-Gen. Korzhenevich, announces that troops of the Fourth Ukrainian Front in coordination with troops of the Second Ukrainian Front on December 3, carried by storm the town of Satoralja Ujhely, regional centre of Hungary, important communications junction and strongpoint of the enemy defences.

The Order mentions 35 commanders of troops, artillerymen, tankmen, airmen, sappers and signallers whose units and formations have distinguished themselves.

("Soviet War News Weekly," No. 151)

ORDER OF THE DAY OF DECEMBER 3, 1944

Order of the Day,addressed to Marshal Malinovsky and Col.-Gen. Zakharov, announces that troops of the Second Ukrainian Front as a result of stubborn fighting, on December 3, carried by storm the town of Miscolkz - large communications junction and powerful strongpoint of the enemy defences, a vital centre of war production in Hungary, supplying the German and Hungarian armies.

The Order mentions 39 commanders of troops, artillerymen, tankmen, airmen, sappers and signallers whose units and formations have distinguished themselves.

A salute of 20 salvoes was fired from 224 Moscow guns.

("Soviet War News Weekly," No. 151)

ORDER OF THE DAY OF DECEMBER 9, 1944

Issued by Marshal Stalin and addressed to the Commander of the Troops of the Second Ukrainian Front, Marshal Malinovsky, and the Chief of Staff of the Front, Col.-Gen. Zakharov.

Troops of the Second Ukrainian Front, having pierced the strongly fortified enemy defences north-east of Budapest, widened the breakthrough to 120 kilometres along the front and, advancing to a depth of 60 kilometres, reached the River Danube, north of Budapest.

At the same time troops of the Front south of Budapest forced the Danube, pierced the enemy defences on the western bank of the river, and at Lake Velenceze joined up with our troops advancing along the western bank of the Danube towards the north.

During offensive engagements troops of the Front captured the important strongpoints of the enemy defence, the towns of Balassagyarmat, Nograd, Vacz, Aszod and Ercsi, and more than 150 other populated places.

In the fighting for the piercing of the enemy defence and the forcing of the Danube, distinction was won by troops commanded by Col.-Gen. Shumilov, Maj.-Gen. Lukin, Lt.-Gen. Shlemin, Maj.-Gen. Birman, Lt.-Gen. Managarov, Maj.-Gen. Yakovlev, Lt.-Gen. Safiulin, Maj.-Gen. Alekhin, Maj.-Gen. Lazko, Maj.-Gen. Gigorovich, Maj.-Gen. Kolchuk, Maj.-Gen. Kruze, Maj.-Gen. Terentyev, Maj.-Gen. Preobrazhensky, Maj.-Gen. Fedorovsky,

Maj.-Gen. Smirnov, Col. Vassilevsky, Col. Korkin, Col. Batluk, Maj.-Gen. Molozhayev, Maj.-Gen. Lilenkov, Col. Voloshin, Maj.-Gen. Sarayev, Col. Dunayev, Maj.-Gen. Karamyshev, Col. Orlov, Maj. Gen. Losev and Maj.-Gen. Zdanovich.

Artillerymen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Artillery Formin, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Shmakov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Petrov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Alexeyenko, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Zykov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Gusarov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Ivanov, Maj.-Gen.of Artillery Bobrovnikov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Popovich, Col. Gushkin, Col. Nekrasov, Col. Rodin, Lt.-Col. Lyubimov, Col. Sapozhnikov, Lt.-Col. Kazak, Lt.-Col. Denisenkov, Lt.-Col. Tronev and Lt.-Col. Kisly.

Tankmen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Tank Troops Kurkin, Col.-Gen. of Tank Troops Kravchenko, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Stromberg, Lt.-Gen. of Tank Troops Volkov, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Savelyev, Lt.-Gen. of Tank Troops Zhdanov and Col. Brizhinev.

Cavalry commanded by Lt.-Gen. Pliyev, Maj.-Gen. Pichugin, Maj.-Gen. Kjuts, Maj.-Gen. Golovsky, Maj.-Gen. Pavlov, Maj.-Gen. Khrustalov, Maj.-Gen. Belousov, Col. Gagua, Col. Nikiforov and Col. Bliznyuk.

Airmen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Aviation Goryunov, Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Seleznev, Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Kamanin, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Prostoserdov, Col. Chenpalov, Col. Romanov and Maj. Sushko.

Sappers commanded by Lt.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Tsirlin, Maj.-Gen. of Engineering

Troops Plyaskin, Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Ignatov, Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Tupichev, Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Tyulev, Col. Tsepenyuk, Col. Kovalenko, Col. Isayev, Col. Myasnikov, Col. Kalinichenko, Col. Massonov and Lt.-Col. Anzaurov.

Signallers commanded by Lt.-Gen. of Signal Troops Leonov, Lt.-Col. Grachev, Col. Egorov, Col. Makarenko, Col. Shervud, Maj. Shishelov and Col. of State Security Karpov.

To commemorate the victory, the units and formations which particularly distinguished themselves in the fighting for the piercing of the enemy defence and the forcing of the Danube will be recommended for the award of orders.

Today, December 9, at 20.00 hours (Moscow time), the capital of our Motherland, Moscow, in the name of the Motherland, will salute with 20 artillery salvoes from 224 guns our gallant troops of the Second Ukrainian Front which pierced the enemy defence and forced the Danube.

For excellent military operations I express my thanks to all the troops under your command which took part in the fighting for the piercing of the enemy defence and the forcing of the Danube. Eternal glory to the heroes who fell in the struggle for the freedom and independence of our Motherland! Death to the German invaders!

J. STALIN
Marshal of the Soviet Union,
Supreme Commander-in-Chief.

("Soviet War News Weekly," No. 152)

ORDER OF THE DAY OF DECEMBER 24, 1944

Issued by Marshal Stalin and addressed to the Commander of the Troops of the Third Ukrainian Front, Marshal Tolbukhin, and the Chief of Staff of the Front, Lt.-Gen. Ivanov.

Troops of the Third Ukrainian Front, breaking through the strongly fortified enemy defences south-west of Budapest, in three days offensive operations have advanced up to 40 kilometres.

During the offensive, the troops of the front captured by storm the towns of Szekesfejervar and Bicske - large centres of communications and important strongpoints in the enemy defences - thus cutting the main paths of retreat to the west for the Budapest grouping of German and Hungarian troops.

In the fighting during the breakthrough of the enemy defences and for the liberation of the towns of Szekesfejervar and Bicske, distinction was won by troops commanded by Army-Gen. Zakharov, Lt.-Gen. Shlemin, Maj.-Gen. Derevyanko, Maj.-Gen. Birman, Maj.-Gen. Biryukov, Maj.-Gen. Bobruk, Maj.-Gen. Gnedin, Lt.-Gen. Rubanyuk, Maj.-Gen. Kolchuk, Maj.-Gen. Grigorovich, Maj.-Gen. Afonin, Col. Chizhov, Col. Drychkin, Col. Bransburg, Col. Parfenov, Col. Kuska, Maj.-Gen. Gorbachev, Maj.-Gen. Bunyashin, Maj.-Gen. Tsvetkov, Maj.-Gen. Margelov, Maj.-Gen. Kindyukhin, Col. Baldynov, Col. Burik, Col. Dunayev, Maj.-Gen. Karamyshev and Maj.-Gen. Sarayev.

Artillerymen commanded by Col.-Gen. of

Artillery Nedelin, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Tsikalo, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Alexeyenko, Lt.-Gen. of Artillery Voznyuk, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Ratov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Bobrovnikov, Col. Mikhailov, Col. Trekhnov, Col. Slepakov, Col. Lupakov, Col. [illegible]isenko, Col. Tarasenko, Col. Romanov, Col. Grazhdankin, Col. Leonov, Lt.-Col. Korovin, Lt.-Col. Oleinik and Lt.-Col. Chepurin.

Tankmen commanded by Lt.-Gen. of Tank Troops Sukhoruchkin, Col. Rumantsyev, Lt.-Gen. Sviridov, Maj.-Gen. Goverunenko, Col. Ognev, Lt.-Gen. Gordeyev, Lt.-Col. Rogachev and Lt.-Col. Gayevsky.

Airmen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Aviation Sudets, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Korsakov, Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Tolstikov, Col. Ivanov, Col. Smirnov, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Fishchenko and Col. Terekhov.

Sappers commanded by Col.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Kotiyar, Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Ignatov and Col. Pavlov.

Signallers commanded by Lt.-Gen. of Signal Troops Korolev, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Morozov, Col. Yegorov and Col. Katkov.

To commemorate the victory, the units and formations which particularly distinguished themselves in the fighting during the breakthrough of the enemy defences and for the liberation of the towns of Szekesfejervar and Bicske will be recommended for the award of orders.

Today, December 24, at 20.00 hours (Moscow time), the capital of our Motherland, Moscow, in the name of the Motherland, will salute with

20 artillery salvoes from 224 guns the gallant troops of the Third Ukrainian Front who broke through the enemy defences and liberated the towns of Szekesfejervar and Bicske.

For excellent military operations I express my thanks to all the troops under your command which took part in the fighting for the breaking through of the enemy defences and the liberation of the towns of Szekesfejervar and Bicske.

Eternal glory to the heroes who fell in the fighting for the freedom and independence of our Motherland!

Death to the German invaders!

J. STALIN
Marshal of the Soviet Union,
Supreme Commander-in-Chief.

("Soviet War News Weekly," No. 154)

MARSHAL STALIN'S THANKS

January 1945

To Dr. Hewlett Johnson, Chairman of Joint Committee for Soviet Aid, London. I thank you, Dr. Johnson, and the members of your Committee, for the warm congratulations and greetings on the occasion of my birthday.

J. STALIN

To Mr. Maclean (Chairman) and Mr. Coates (Secretary), Anglo-Russian Parliamentary Committee, London. I thank you, Mr. Maclean and Mr. Coates, and the Anglo-Russian Parliament-

ary Committee, for the greetings on the occasion of my birthday.

J. STALIN

("Soviet War News Weekly," No.156)

ORDER OF THE DAY, NO.223, JANUARY 17, 1945

Addressed to the Commander of the Troops of the 1st Byelorussian Front, Marshal Zhukov, and to the Chief of Staff of the Front, Col.-Gen. Malinin.

Troops of the 1st Byelorussian Front, having effected a swift out-flanking manoeuvre west of Warsaw, captured the town of Zirardow, cut the roads to Sochaczow, forced the Vistula north of Warsaw and thus, having cut off Warsaw from the west, today, January 17, by a combined blow from north, west and south, captured the capital of our ally Poland, the city of Warsaw - most important strategic centre of the German defence on the River Vistula.

In the fighting for the capture of the city of Warsaw, distinction was won by troops commanded by Maj.-Gen. Perkhorovich, Col.-Gen. Belov, Lt.-Gen. Poplawski of the 1st Polish Army, Lt.-Gen. Klubnyanchenko, Maj.-Gen. Strazhevski, Lt.-Gen. Pulko-Dmitriev, Maj.-Gen. Andreyev, Maj.-Gen. Anashkin, Maj.-Gen. Pozdnyak, Maj.-Gen. Chernov, Col. Vadrigan, Maj.-Gen. Zaikin, Col. Solovyev, Col. Pavlovsky, Col. Muzykin, Maj.-Gen. Rotkovich, Col. Shaipak, Maj.-Gen. Bovzyuk, Col. Zaikovsky, Maj.-Gen. Kinovich and Col. Radzivanovich; Artillerymen commanded by Lt.-Gen. of Artillery Kozin, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Modzilevsky, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Platsky, Col. Blonsky, Col. Vikentyev, Col. Skokovsky, Col. Bhelikovsky, Col. Kerp, Col. Prokopovich, Col. Grekhov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Lyarsky, Col. Kolokolov, Col. Yalovatsky, Col. Yurgelevich, Col. Vashichev, Lt.-Col. Mukhachev, Maj. Popovich, Lt.-Col. Vasilchev and Lt-Col. Mikhailovsky; Tankmen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Tank Troops Bogdanov, Lt.-Gen. Radzievsky, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Vedeneyev, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Telyakov, Lt.-Gen. of Tank Troops Krivoshein, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Kretov, Lt.-Col. Korost, Col. Yeremeyov, Col. Malyutin and Lt.-Col. Tsurychin; Airmen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Aviation Rudenko, Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Brayko, Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Savitsky, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Karavatsky, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Dzusov, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Tokarev, Col. Timofeyev, Col. Belousov, Col. Sukhoryabov, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Komarov, Col. Rasskasov, Lt.-Col. Nakonechnik, Col. Sitkin, Col. Buzylev, Col. Berkal, Col. Ivanov, Col. Romeyko, Lt.-Col. Sherstyuk and Lt.-Col. Gavrilchenko; Sappers commanded by Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Komarov, Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Bordzilovsky, Col. Belsky, Col. Kiselev, Col. Lyubansky, Col. Puzeretsky and Lt.-Col. Khovratovich; and Signallers commanded by by Col. Solovyev, Col. Suchek, Col. Zarudsky, Col. Smoli, Lt.-Col. Vakish and Lt.-Col. Stupachenko.

To commemorate the victory, the units and formations which particularly distinguished them-

selves in the fighting for the capture of the city of Warsaw will be recommended for conferment of the name "Warsaw" and award of orders.

Today, January 17, at 19.00 hours (Moscow time), the capital of our Motherland, Moscow, in the name of the Motherland, will salute with 24 salvoes from 324 guns our gallant troops of the 1st Byelorussian Front, including troops of the 1st Polish Army, which captured the capital of Poland, Warsaw.

For excellent military operations I express my thanks to all the troops under your Command, including the troops of the 1st Polish Army, which took part in the fighting for the liberation of Warsaw.

Eternal glory to the heroes who fell in the struggle for the freedom and independence of our Motherland and our Ally Poland!

Death to the German invaders!

J. STALIN

Supreme Commander-in-Chief,
Marshal of the Soviet Union.
Moscow.

("Stalin's War Speeches, etc." p. 117)

ORDER OF THE DAY, NO. 227, FEBRUARY 13, 1945

Addressed to the Commander of the Troops of the 2nd Ukrainian Front, Marshal Malinovsky, and to the Chief of Staff of the Front, Col.-Gen. Zakharov; and to the Commander of the Troops of the 3rd Ukrainian Front, Marshal Tolbukhin, and to the Chief of Staff of the Front, Lt.-Gen. Ivanov.

Troops of the 2nd Ukrainian Front, assisted by troops of the 3rd Ukrainian Front, after one and a half months siege and stubborn fighting under the difficult conditions of a large city, today, February 13, completed the rout of the encircled enemy grouping in Budapest, and so completely captured the capital of Hungary, the city of Budapest, a strategically important German defence centre on the roads to Vienna.

During the fighting in the city of Budapest, troops of the 2nd Ukrainian Front took prisoner more than 110,000 enemy officers and men, headed by the German commander of the Budapest troop grouping, Col.-Gen. Pfeffer Wildenbruch, and his staff; they also seized a large quantity of arms and various military supplies.

In the fighting for the capture of Budapest, distinction was won by the troops commanded by Maj.-Gen. Afonin, Lt.-Gen. Managarov, Col.-Gen Shumilov, Lt.-Gen. Shlemin, Army-Gen. Zakharov, Maj.-Gen. Filippovsky, Maj.-Gen. Lukin, Maj.-Gen. Birman, Maj.-Gen. Derevyanko, Maj.-Gen. Kolchuk, Maj.-Gen. Akimenko, Maj.-Gen. Lazko, Lt.-Gen. Rubanyuk, Maj.-Gen. Grigorovich, Maj.-Gen. Biryukov, Lt.-Gen. Fomenko, Maj.-Gen. Bobruk, Lt.-Gen. Petrushevsky, Lt.-Gen. Gorshkov, Lt.-Gen. Vostrukhov, Maj.-Gen. Sosedov, Col. Kovtun-Stankevich, Col. Peremanov, Col. Chebotarev, Col. Burik, Col. Zhashko, Maj.-Gen. Frolov, Col. Gushchin, Maj.-Gen. Nek-

rasov, Col. Baldynov, Maj.-Gen. Lilenkov, Col. Batluk, Maj.-Gen. Podshivalov, Col. Dunayev, Col. Smirnov, Col. Gorobets, Maj.-Gen. Karamyshev, Maj.-Gen. Afonin, Col. Drykchin, Maj.-Gen. Tsvetkov, Col. Moshlyak, Col. Kuks, Col. Parfenov, Col. Bransburg, Col. Derziyan, Maj.-Gen. Bunyashin, Col. Chizhov, Col. Sergeyev, Col. Naidishev, Maj.-Gen. Sokolovsky, Maj.-Gen. Margelov and Col. Lirov; Artillerymen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Artillery Fomin, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Shmakov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Kotikov, Col.-Gen. of Artillery Nedelin, Lt.-Gen. of Artillery Voznyuk, Lt.-Gen. of Artillery Petrov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Alexeyenko, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Tsikalo, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Gusarov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Ivanov, Col. Vorobyev, Col. Novikov, Col. Ponomarov, Col. Trekhnov, Col. Adamchik, Col. Strok, Engineer-Col. Brovarnik, Col. Miranov, Col. Koroteyev, Col. Kryzhevich, Col. Sedash, Col. Pastukh, Col. Bogushevich, Col. Lupakov, Col. Gushchin, Col. Rodin, Col. Motov, Col. Komarov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Ratov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Bobrobnikov, Col. Solovyev, Col. Grishchenko, Col. Leonov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Danshin, Col. Rashitsky, Col. Gotsak, Col. Salansky, Col. Lupakov, Lt.-Col. Popolzhukin, Lt.-Col. Matyukha, Lt.-Col. Tarasenko, Lt.-Col. Pavlik, Lt.-Col. Kozyarenko, Lt.-Col. Breyev, Maj. Borodin, Lt.-Col. Tronev, Lt.-Col. Samchenko, Lt.-Col. Prokhorov, Lt.-Col. Borodko, Lt.-Col. Shpek and Maj. Voronov; Tankmen commanded by Col.-Gen.of Tank Troops Kurkin, Lt.-Gen. of Tank Troops Akhmanov,Lt.-Gen.

Sviridov, Lt.-Gen. Russiayanov, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Govorunenko, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Katkov, Col. Rumantsyev, Col. Tyaglov, Maj.Apolovnin, Senior Lt. Grigoryev,Capt.Lapin and Capt. Kutuzov; Airmen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Aviation Goryunov, Col.-Gen. of Aviation Sudets, Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Seleznev, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Korsakov, Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Stepichev, Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Podgorny, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Kamanin, Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Tolstikov, Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Tupikov, Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Loginov, Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Shchetchikov, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Lededev, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Belitsky, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Tishchenko, Col. Romanov, Col. Chanpalov, Col. Shuteyev, Col. Chizhikov, Col. Saprykin, Col. Semenenko, Col. Yudakov, Col. Taranenko, Col. Geibo, Col. Terekhov, Col. Ivanov, Col. Nedosekin, Col. Dementyev, Col. Smirnov and Lt.-Col. Shatilin; Sappers commanded by Lt.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Tsirlin, Col.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Kotlyar, Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Plyaskin, Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Ignatov, Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Vasilyev, Maj.-Gen. of Technical Troops Kosenko, Col. Malov, Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Tyulev, Col. Kovalenko, Col. Pavlov, Col. Nasonov, Col. Zagrebin,Col. Baburin, Col. Kalinichenko, Col. Nominas,Lt.-Col. Fominykh, Lt.-Col. Sheludko, Lt.-Col. Yagodin, Maj.Markov, Engineer Maj. Dyukov, Lt.-Col. Anzaurov, Maj. Fomenko, Engineer Lt.-Col. Ragozin and Lt.-Col. Korneyev; Signallers commanded by Lt.-Gen. of Signals Troops Leonov, Lt.-Gen. of

Signals Troops Korolev, Col. Borisenko, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Morozov, Lt.-Col. Reva, Lt.-Col. Zhits, Lt.-Col. Agupov, Maj. Tolsty, Col. of State Security Karpov, Col. Yegorov and Col. Kotkov; and by units and ships of the Danube Naval Flotilla commanded by Rear-Admiral Kholostyakov and Capt. of the 2nd Rank Derzhavin.

To commemorate the victory, the units and formations which particularly distinguished themselves in the fighting for the capture of the city of Budapest will be recommended for conferment of the name "Budapest" and for award of orders.

Today, February 13, at 21.00 hours (Moscow time) the capital of our Motherland, Moscow, in the name of the Motherland, will salute with 24 artillery salvoes from 324 guns the gallant troops of the 2nd and 3rd Ukrainian Fronts which captured the capital of Hungary, the city of Budapest.

For excellent military operations I express my thanks to all the troops under your command which took part in the fighting for the capture of Budapest.

Eternal glory to the heroes who fell in the fighting for the freedom and independence of our Motherland!

Death to the German invaders!

J. STALIN
Supreme Commander-in-Chief,
Marshal of the Soviet Union.
Moscow.

("Stalin's War Speeches, etc." P. 119)

ORDER OF THE DAY, NO. 5, FEBRUARY 23, 1945

Comrades, Red Army men and Red Navy men, sergeants, officers and generals! Today we are celebrating the 27th Anniversary of the Red Army's existence.

Created by the great Lenin to defend our Motherland from the attack of foreign invaders, and reared by the Bolshevik Party, the Red Army has traversed a glorious path in its development. It has fulfilled with credit its historic destiny and is rightfully the beloved child of the Soviet people.In the years of the civil war the Red Army defended the young Soviet State from numerous enemies. In the great battles of the Patriotic War against German invasion the Red Army has saved the peoples of the Soviet Union from German-fascist slavery, upheld the freedom and independence of our Motherland, and helped the peoples of Europe to cast off the German yoke.

Now we are celebrating the 27th Anniversary of the Red Army in the midst of fresh historic victories over the enemy. The Red Army has not only freed its native land of the Hitlerite filth,but also hurled the enemy for many hundreds of kilometres back beyond those lines from which the Germans launched their bandit attack upon our country, carried the war into Germany's territory and now, together with the armies of our Allies, is successfully completing the rout of the German-fascist army.

In January of this year, the Red Army brought down upon the enemy a blow of unparalleled force along the entire front from the Baltic to the Carpathians. On a stretch of 1,200 kilometres (750 miles), it broke up the powerful defences of the Germans which they had been building for a number of years. In the course of the offensive the Red Army by its swift and skilful actions, has hurled the enemy far back to the West. In stiff fighting the Soviet troops have advanced from the frontiers of East Prussia to the lower reaches of the Vistula -270 kilometres (175 miles), from the Vistula bridgehead south of Warsaw to the lower reaches of the Oder -570 kilometres (355 miles),and from the Sandomir bridgehead into the depth of German Silesia -480 kilometres (3[illegible] miles).

The first consequence of the successes of our winter offensive was that they thwarted the Germans' winter offensive in the west,which aimed at the seizure of Belgium and Alsace, and enabled the armies of our Allies in their turn to launch an offensive against the Germans and thus link up their offensive operations in the west with the offensive operations of the Red Army in the east.

In forty days of the offensive in January-February, 1945, our troops have ejected the Germans from 300 towns, captured about 100 war plants, manufacturing tanks, aircraft, armaments and ammunition, occupied over 2,400 railway stations and seized a network of railways totalling over 15,000 kilometres (9,375 miles) in length.

Within this short period Germany has lost over 350,000 officers and men in prisoners of war and not less than 800,000 in killed. During the same period the Red Army has destroyed or seized about 3,000 German aircraft, over 4,500 tanks and self-propelled guns and not less than 12,000 guns.

As a result, the Red Army has completely liberated Poland and a considerable part of the territory of Czechoslovakia, occupied Budapest and put out of the war Germany's last ally in Europe, Hungary, captured the greater part of East Prussia and German Silesia and battled its way into Brandenburg, into Pomerania, to the approaches to Berlin.

The Hitlerites boasted that for more than a hundred years not a single enemy soldier had been within Germany's borders,and that the German army had fought and would fight only on foreign soil. Now an end has been put to this German bragging.

Our winter offensive has shown that the Red Army finds more and more strength for the solution of ever more complex and difficult problems. Its glorious soldiers have learned to batter and annihilate the enemy in accordance with all the rules of modern military science.Our soldiers, inspired by the realization of their great mission of liberation,display miracles of heroism and selflessness, and ably combine gallantry and audacity in battle with full utilization of the power and strength of their weapons. The Red Army generals and officers in masterly manner combine massed blows of powerful equipment with skilful

and swift manoeuvre. In the fourth year of the war, the Red Army has grown stronger and mightier than ever before, its combat equipment has become still more perfect and its fighting mastery many times higher.

Comrades, Red Army men and Red Navy men, sergeants, officers and generals!

Complete victory over the Germans is now already near. But victory never comes of itself - it is won in hard battles and in persistent labour. The doomed enemy hurls his last forces into action, resists desperately in order to escape stern retribution. He grasps and will grasp at the most extreme and base means of struggle. Therefore it should be borne in mind that the nearer our victory, the higher must be our vigilance and the heavier must be our blows at the enemy.

On behalf of the Soviet Government and our glorious Bolshevik Party, I greet and congratulate you upon the 27th Anniversary of the Red Army!

To mark the great victories achieved by the armed forces of the Soviet State in the course of the past year, I order:

Today, February 23, on the day of the 27th Anniversary of the Red Army,at 20.00 hours(Moscow time) a salute of 20 artillery salvoes shall be fired in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Minsk, Petrozavodsk, Tallinn, Riga, Vilnius, Kishinev,Tbilisi, Stalingrad, Sevastopol, Odessa and Lvov.

Long live our glorious Red Army!

Long live our victorious Navy!

Long live our mighty Soviet Motherland!

Eternal glory to the heroes who fell in the struggle for the freedom and independence of our Motherland!

Death to the German invaders!

J. STALIN

Supreme Commander-in-Chief,
Marshal of the Soviet Union.
Moscow.

("Stalin's War Speeches, etc." P. 121)

REPLY TO THE MESSAGE FROM GROZA AND TATARESCU, MARCH 29, 1945

To the President of the Ministers Council of Rumania, Peter Groza.
Copy for the Vice-President of the Ministers Council and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, G. Tatarescu.

Mr. President,

The Soviet Government has examined the demand of the Rumanian Government stated in your letter of March 8, concerning the establishment of Rumanian administration in the territory of Transylvania.

Taking into account that the new Rumanian Government, which now ensures the management of the country, takes upon itself the responsibility for necessary order and peace in the territory of Transylvania and the satisfaction of the rights of nationalities, as well as the conditions for the correct working of all local institutions serving the needs of the Front, the Soviet Government has decided to satisfy the request of the Ruman-

ian Government and, conforming to the Agreement on the Armistice of September 12, 1944, to consent to the establishment of the administration of the Rumanian Government in Transylvania.

J. STALIN
President of the Council of Commissaries of the People.

("Pravda," 10 March, 1945)

ORDER OF THE DAY, NO. 334, APRIL 13, 1945

Addressed to the Commander of the Troops of the 3rd Ukrainian Front, Marshal Tolbukhin, and to the Chief of Staff of the Front, Lt.-Gen. Ivanov.

Troops of the 3rd Ukrainian Front, with the support of troops of the 2nd Ukrainian Front, after stiff street-fighting today, April 13, captured the capital of Austria, the city of Vienna, a strategically important centre of the German defences covering the routes to the southern areas of Germany.

During the course of the fighting for the approaches to Vienna and for the city of Vienna, from March 16 to April 13, the troops of the Front routed 11 German Tank Divisions, including the 6th S.S. Tank Army, took prisoner more than 130,000 enemy officers and men, and destroyed or captured 1,345 tanks and self-propelled guns, 2,250 field guns and much other military equipment.

In the fighting for the capture of the city of Vienna distinction was won by troops commanded by Col.-Gen. Glagolev, Lt.-Gen. Zakhvateyev, Lt.-Gen. Petrushevsky, Lt.-Gen. Tikhonov, Lt.-Gen. Utvenko, Lt.-Gen. Mironov, Lt.-Gen. Bakhtin, Lt.-Gen. Rubanyuk, Maj.-Gen. Dereyanko, Maj.-Gen. Rozhdstvensky, Maj.-Gen. Biryukov, Maj.-Gen. Kozak, Maj.-Gen. Bobruk, Maj.-Gen. Shkodunovich, Maj.-Gen. Afonin, Maj.-Gen. Tsvetkov, Maj.-Gen. Panchenko, Maj.-Gen. Dznakhua, Maj.-Gen. Makarenko, Maj.-Gen. Bogdanov, Maj.-Gen. Denischenko, Maj.-Gen. Afonin, Col. Drychkin, Col. Chizhov, Col. Kuks, Col. Bransburg and Col. Vindushev; Ships and units of the Red Banner Danube Flotilla commanded by Rear-Admiral Kholostyakov, Lt.-Capt. Barbotko and Lt.-Capt. Veliki; Artillerymen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Artillery Nedelin, Lt.-Gen. of Artillery Voznyuk, Lt.-Gen. of Artillery Nesteruk, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Tsikalo, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Breshnev, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Gussev, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Ratov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Velikolepov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Alexeyenko, Col. Fedorov, Col. Yeletsky, Col. Slepakov, Col. Borissenko, Col. Pleshakov, Col. Chernov, Col. Prokhotov, Col. Bulakhtik, Col. Leonov, Col. Lupanov, Lt.-Col. Zhkutsky, Maj. Voronov and Maj. Glebov; Tankmen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Tank Troops Kravchenko, Lt.-Gen. of Tank Troops Volkov, Lt.-Gen. Russyanov, Lt.-Gen. Sviridov, Lt.-Gen. of Tank Troops Akhmanov, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Pavelkin, Maj.-Gen. of Tank-Troops Stromberg, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Savelyev, Maj.-Gen. Govorunenko, Col. Ty-

aglov, Col. Budnikov, Col. Rumantsyev, Col. Obdalenkov, Col. Ivanov, Col. Sakharov, Lt.-Col. Savelyev and Lt.-Col. Siman; Airmen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Aviation Sudets, Col.-Gen.of Aviation Goryunov, Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Zlatotsvetov, Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Tolstikov, Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Seleznev, Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Stepichev, Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Podgorny, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Korsakov, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Belitsky, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Tishchenko, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Kamanin, Col. Nedosekin, Col. Dementyev, Col. Smirnov, Col. Ivanov, Col. Terekhov and Lt.-Col. Shatilin; Sappers commanded by Col. Gen. of Engineering Troops Kotlyar, Col. Malov, Col. Vodovatov, Col. Fadeyev, Col. Pavlov, Col. Zgrebin, Col. Baburin, Col. Nominas, Lt.-Col. Korneyev, Lt.-Col. Matuzas and Lt.-Col.Galukovich; Signallers commanded by Lt.-Gen. of Signals Troops Korolev, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Morozov,Col. Shervud, Col. Kotkov, Col. Yegorov and Lt.-Col. Sukhikh.

To commemorate the victory, the units and formations which particularly distinguished themselves in the fighting for the capture of the city of Vienna will be recommended for conferment of the name "Vienna" and award of orders.

Today, April 13, at 21.00 hours (Moscow time), the capital of our Motherland, Moscow, in the name of the Motherland, will salute with 24 artillery salvoes from 324 guns the gallant troops of the 3rd Ukrainian Front which captured the city of Vienna.

For excellent military operations I express

my thanks to all the troops under your command which took part in the fighting for the liberation of Vienna.

Eternal glory to the heroes who fell in the fighting for the freedom and independence of our Motherland!

Death to the German invaders!

J. STALIN

Supreme Commander-in-Chief,
Marshal of the Soviet Union.
Moscow.

("Stalin's War Speeches, etc." P. 124)

ORDER OF THE DAY, NO. 335, APRIL 13, 1945

Addressed to the Commander of the Troops of the 2nd Ukrainian Front, Marshal Malinovsky, and to the Chief of Staff of the Front, Col.-Gen. Zakharov.

On April 13, troops of the 2nd Ukrainian Front, continuing their offensive,captured on Czechoslovak territory the town of Hodonin, an important road junction and powerful German defence strongpoint on the western banks of the Morava river.

The Order mentions 37 commanders of troops, cavalrymen, artillerymen, tankmen, airmen, sappers and signallers whose units and formations distinguished themselves.

A salute of 12 salvoes was fired from 124 Moscow guns.

("Soviet War News Weekly," No. 170)

ORDER OF THE DAY, NO. 336, APRIL 15, 1945

Addressed to the Commander of the Troops of the 3rd Ukrainian Front, Marshal Tolbukhin, and to the Chief of Staff of the Front, Lt.-Gen. Ivanov.

Troops of the 3rd Ukrainian Front,continuing their offensive, on April 15 captured on Austrian territory the town of St. Poelten, an important road junction and powerful German defence strongpoint on the River Traisen.

The Order mentions 37 commanders of troops, artillerymen, tankmen, airmen, sappers and signallers whose units and formations distinguished themselves.

A salute of 12 salvoes was fired from 124 Moscow guns.

("Soviet War News Weekly," No. 170)

ORDER OF THE DAY, NO. 337, APRIL 15, 1945

Addressed to the Commander of the Troops of the 2nd Ukrainian Front, Marshal Malinovsky, and to the Chief of Staff of the Front, Col.-Gen. Zakharov.

Troops of the 2nd Ukrainian Front, with the collaboration of troops of the 3rd Ukrainian Front, have surrounded and routed a grouping of German troops which attempted to retreat from Vienna to the north,and have captured the towns of Korneuberg and Florisdorf - powerful German

defence strongholds on the left bank of the Danube.

In the fighting, troops of the Front took prisoner more than 3,000 German officers and men, and also captured large quantities of arms and other war material.

The Order mentions 42 commanders of troops, ships and units of the Red Banner Danube Flotilla, artillerymen, tankmen, airmen, sappers and signallers whose units and formations distinguished themselves.

A salute of 20 salvoes was fired from 224 Moscow guns.

("Soviet War News Weekly," No. 170)

SPEECH OF APRIL 21, 1945

On the occasion of the signing of the Treaty of Friendship, Mutual Assistance and Post-War Collaboration between the U.S.S.R. and the Polish Republic.

Mr. President,Mr. Prime Minister, Gentlemen!

I believe that the Treaty of Friendship, Mutual Assistance and Post-War Collaboration between the Soviet Union and Poland, which we have just signed is of great historic importance.

The importance of this Treaty consists in the first place in that it signifies the radical turn of relations between the Soviet Union and Poland towards alliance and friendship, a turn which took shape in the course of the present liberation struggle against Germany and which is now being formally consummated in this Treaty.

It is known that relations between our countries in the course of the past five centuries have abounded in elements of mutual estrangement, unfriendliness, and not infrequently in open military conflicts. Such relations weakened both our countries and strengthened German imperialism.

The importance of the present Treaty consists in that it puts an end to these old relations between our countries, nails down the lid of the coffin over them, and creates a real basis for replacement of the old unfriendly relations by relations of alliance and friendship between the Soviet Union and Poland.

In the course of the last two World Wars the Germans succeeded in making use of the territory of Poland as a corridor for invasion of the East and as a springboard for attack on the Soviet Union. This became possible because at that time there were no friendly allied relations between our countries. The former rulers of Poland did not want to have relations of alliance with the Soviet Union. They preferred a policy of playing about between Germany and the Soviet Union. And of course they played themselves into trouble...Poland was occupied, her independence abolished, and as a result of this whole ruinous policy German troops were enabled to appear at the gates of Moscow.

The importance of the present Treaty consists in that it puts an end to the old and ruinous policy of playing about between Germany and the Soviet Union, and replaces it by a policy of

alliance and friendship between Poland and her Eastern neighbour.

Such is the historic importance of the Treaty between Poland and the Soviet Union on Friendship, Mutual Assistance and Post-War Collaboration which we have just signed.

No wonder, therefore, that the peoples of our countries impatiently await the signing of this Treaty.They feel that this Treaty is a pledge of the independence of new, democratic Poland, a pledge of her might and her prosperity.

But matters are not confined to that. The present Treaty has also great international significance. As long as there existed no alliance between our countries Germany was able to take advantage of the absence of a united front between us, she could oppose Poland to the Soviet Union and vice versa, and thus beat them one at a time. Things changed radically after the alliance between our countries took shape. Now it is no longer possible to oppose our countries to each other. Now there exists a united front between our countries from the Baltic to the Carpathians against the common enemy, against German inperialism. Now one may confidently say that German aggression is besieged from the East. Undoubtedly if this barrier in the East is supplemented by a barrier in the West, that is, by alliance between our countries and our Allies in the West, one may safely say that German aggression will be curbed, and that it will not be easy for it to run loose.

No wonder, therefore, that the freedom-lov-

ing nations, and in the first place the Slav nations, impatiently await the conclusion of this Treaty, for they see that this Treaty signifies a strengthening of the united front of the United Nations against the common enemy in Europe.

Therefore, I do not doubt that our Allies in the West will welcome this Treaty.

May free, independent, democratic Poland live and prosper!

May her Eastern neighbour - our Soviet Union - live and prosper!

Long live the alliance and friendship between our countries!

("Stalin's War Speeches, etc." P. 126)

ORDER OF THE DAY, NO. 346, APRIL 27, 1945

To the Army on Active Service.

The troops of the 1st Ukrainian Front and our Allied British and American troops, striking from the East and West, severed the front of the German troops, and on April 25, at 13.30 hours, effected a junction in the middle of Germany, in the region of Torgau. As a result, the German troops located in North Germany have been cut off from the German troops in the southern regions of Germany.

To mark this victory, and in honour of this historic event, today, April 27, at 19.00 hours, the capital of of our country, Moscow, will, on behalf of our country, salute the valiant troops

of the 1st Ukrainian Front and our Allied British and American troops with 24 artillery salvoes, fired from 324 guns.

Long live the victory of the freedom-loving nations over Germany.

J. STALIN

Supreme Commander-in-Chief,
Marshal of the Soviet Union.

("Soviet Calendar 1917 - 1947")

MESSAGE BROADCAST ON THE EVENING OF APRIL 27, 1945, TO THE OFFICERS AND MEN OF THE RED ARMY, AND OF THE ARMIES OF THE ALLIES ON THE OCCASION OF THEIR LINKING UP ON GERMAN SOIL

In the name of the Soviet Government, I address you, commanders and men of the Red Army, and of the armies of our Allies.

The victorious armies of the Allied Powers, waging a war of liberation in Europe, have routed the German troops and linked up on the territory of Germany.

Our task and our duty are to complete the destruction of the enemy, to force him to lay down his arms and surrender unconditionally. The Red Army will fulfil to the end this task and this duty to our people, and to all freedom-loving peoples.

I greet the valorous troops of our Allies, which are now standing on the territory of Germany shoulder to shoulder with the Soviet troops and which are full of determination to carry out their duty to the end.

("Soviet Calendar 1917 - 1947")

TO THE EDITORIAL STAFF OF "KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA", MAY 1945

I congratulate the fighting organ of Soviet youth, the paper "Komsomolskaya Pravda", on her twenty years.

During the years of peaceful construction and throughout the days of the Great Patriotic War, "Komsomolskaya Pravda" has educated the Soviet youth in the spirit of unreserved service to the Motherland.

I am sure that in the future, the "Komsomolskaya Pravda" is going to successfully accomplish educational tasks towards the next generation in the devoted spirit to the Leninist Party, to help youth to achieve the realizations of science and culture, to strengthen the forces of the young patriots for battle, with a view to the ultimate flourishing of our great Motherland!

J. STALIN

("Pravda," 24 May, 1945)

ORDER OF THE DAY, NO. 20, OF MAY 1; 1945

Comrades, Red Army men and Red Navy men, sergeants and petty officers, officers of the Army and Navy, generals and admirals!

Working people of the Soviet Union!

Today our country is celebrating the 1st of May - the international festival of the working people.

This year, the peoples of our Motherland

are celebrating May Day under conditions of the victorious termination of the Great Patriotic War.

The hard times when the Red Army fought back the enemy troops at Moscow and Leningrad, at Grozny and Stalingrad, are gone - never to return. Now our victorious troops are battering the enemy's armed forces in the centre of Germany, far beyond Berlin, on the River Elbe.

Within a short time Poland, Hungary, the greater part of Czechoslovakia, a considerable part of Austria, and her capital Vienna,have been liberated.

At the same time the Red Army has captured East Prussia, home of German imperialism, Pomerania, the greater part of Brandenburg and the main districts of Germany's capital Berlin, having hoisted the banner of victory over Berlin.

As a result of these offensive battles fought by the Red Army, within 3 to 4 months the Germans have lost over 800,000 officers and men in prisoners and about 1 million in killed. During the same period the Red Army troops have captured or desptroyed up to 6,000 enemy aircraft, up to 12,000 tanks and self-propelled guns, over 23,000 field guns and enormous quantities of other armaments and equipment.

It should be noted that in these battles Polish, Yugoslav, Czechoslovak, Bulgarian and Rumanian divisions successfully advanced against the common enemy side by side with the Red Army.

As a result of the Red Army's shattering blows, the German Command was compelled to transfer dozens of divisions to the Soviet-German Front, baring whole sectors on other fronts. This circumstance helped the forces of our Allies to develop their successful offensive in the West. Thus by simultaneous blows at the German troops from East and West, the troops of the Allies and the Red Army were able to cut the German forces into two isolated parts and to effect a junction of our troops and the Allied troops in a united front.

There can be no doubt that this circumstance means the end of Hitlerite Germany.

The days of Hitlerite Germany are numbered. More than half her territory is occupied by the Red Army and by the troops of our Allies. Germany has lost the most important, vital districts. The industry remaining in the Hitlerites' hands cannot supply the German army with sufficient quantities of armaments, ammunition and fuel. The man-power reserves of the German army are depleted. Germany is completely isolated and stands alone, if her ally Japan is not counted.

In search of a way out from their hopeless plight, the Hitlerite adventurers resort to all kinds of tricks, down to flirting with the Allies, in an effort to cause dissension in the Allied camp. These fresh knavish tricks of the Hitlerites are doomed to utter failure. They can only accelerate the disintegration of the German troops.

Mendacious fascist propaganda intimidates the German population by absurd tales, alleging

that the Armies of the United Nations wish to exterminate the German people. The United Nations do not set themselves the task of destroying the German people. The United Nations will destroy fascism and German militarism, will severely punish war criminals, and will compel the Germans to compensate damage they have caused to other countries. But the United Nations do not molest and will not molest Germany's civilian population if it honestly fulfils the demands of the Allied military authorities.

The brilliant victories won by the Soviet troops in the Great Patriotic War have demonstrated the colossal might of the Red Army and its high military skill. In the progress of the war our Motherland has come to possess a first-rate regular army, capable of upholding the great Socialist achievements of our people and of securing the State interests of the Soviet Union.

Despite the fact that the Soviet Union has for nearly four years been waging war on an unparalleled scale demanding colossal expenditures, our Socialist economic system is gaining strength and developing, while the economy of the liberated regions, plundered and ruined by the German invaders, is successfully and swiftly reviving. This is the result of the heroic efforts of the workers and collective farmers, of the Soviet intellectuals, of the women and the youth of our country, inspired and guided by the great Bolshevik Party.

The world war unleashed by the German imperialists is drawing to a close. The collapse

of Hitlerite Germany is a matter of the nearest future. The Hitlerite ringleaders, who imagined themselves rulers of the world, have found themselves ruined. The mortally wounded fascist beast is breathing its last. One thing is now required - to deal the death-blow to the fascist beast.

Fighting men of the Red Army and Navy!

The last storming of the Hitlerite lair is on. Set new examples of military skill and gallantry in the concluding battles. Smite the enemy harder, skilfully break up his defence, pursue and surround the German invaders, give them no respite until they cease resistance.

Beyond the border of our native land be especially vigilant!

Uphold the honour and dignity of the Soviet soldier as heretofore!

Working people of the Soviet Union!

Increase your all-round assistance to the front by persistent and indefatigable work. Swiftly heal the wounds inflicted on our country by the war, raise still higher the might of our Soviet State!

Comrades, Red Army men and Red Navy men, sergeants and petty officers, officers of the Army and Navy, generals and admirals!

Working people of the Soviet Union!

On behalf of the Soviet Government and of our Bolshevik Party, I greet you and congratulate you upon the 1st of May.

In honour of the historic victories of the Red Army at the front and of the great achievements of the workers, collective farmers and intellectuals in the rear, to mark the international festival of the working people, I hereby order:

Today, on May 1, a salute of 20 artillery salvoes shall be fired in the capitals of Union Republics - Moscow, Kiev, Minsk, Baku, Tbilisi, Erevan, Ashkabad, Tashkent, Stalinabad, Alma-Ata, Frunze, Petrozavodsk, Kishinev, Vilnius, Riga and Tallinn - as well as in the hero-cities of Leningrad, Stalingrad, Sevastopol and Odessa.

Long live our mighty Soviet Motherland!

Long live the great Soviet people, the people victorious!

Long live the victorious Red Army and Navy!

Eternal glory to the heroes who fell in the battles for the freedom and independence of our Motherland!

Forward to the final rout of Hitlerite Germany!

J. STALIN

Supreme Commander-in-Chief,
Marshal of the Soviet Union.
Moscow.

("Stalin's War Speeches, etc." P. 128)

ORDER OF THE DAY, NO. 359, OF MAY 2,1945

Addressed to the Red Army and Navy.

Troops of the 1st Byelorussian Front commanded by Marshal of the Soviet Union Zhukov, with the support of troops of the 1st Ukrainian

Front commanded by Marshal of the Soviet Union Koniev, after stiff street-fighting, have completed the rout of the Berlin German troop grouping, and today, May 2, completely captured the capital of Germany, Berlin - centre of German imperialism and hotbed of German aggression.

The Berlin garrison which defended the city with the Chief of the Defence of Berlin, Artillery General Weidling, and his staff at the head, today at 15.00 hours ceased resistance, laid down their arms and surrendered.

By 21.00 hours on May 2 our troops had taken prisoner more than 70,000 German officers and men in Berlin.

In the fighting for the capture of Berlin, distinction was won by troops commanded by Army-Gen. Sokolovsky, Col.-Gen. Kuznetsov, Col.-Gen. Chuikov, Col.-Gen. Berzarin, Lt.-Gen. Luchinsky, Lt.-Gen. Perkhorovich, Lt.-Gen. Lukyanchenko, Col.-Gen. Cherevichenko, Lt.-Gen. Kazankin, Lt.-Gen. Glazunov, Lt.-Gen. Ryzhev, Lt.-Gen. Zherebin, Lt.-Gen. Rosly, Lt.-Gen. Tereshkov, Lt.-Gen. Andreyev, Maj.-Gen. Bukshtynovich, Maj.-Gen. Belyavsky, Maj.-Gen. Kushchev, Maj.-Gen. Barinov, Maj.-Gen. Perevertkin, Maj.-Gen. Rogachevsky, Maj.-Gen. Batitsky, Maj.-Gen. Shvarev, Maj.-Gen. Firsov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Khetagurov, Maj.-Gen. Shatilov, Maj.-Gen. Shafarenko, Maj.-Gen. Smirnov, Maj.-Gen. Kozin, Maj.-Gen. Karapetyan, Maj.-Gen. Krasilnikov, Maj.-Gen. Shugayev, Maj.-Gen. Zalezyuk, Maj.-Gen. Stankevsky, Maj.-Gen. Pankov, Maj.-Gen. Glebov, Maj.-Gen. Bakanov, Maj.-Gen. Duka, Maj.-Gen. Seryugin, Maj.-

Gen. Gasparyan, Maj.-Gen. Sokolov, Maj.-Gen. Dorofeyev, Maj.-Gen. Syzranov, Maj.-Gen. Vydrigan, Maj.-Gen. Bevsyuk, Maj.-Gen. Myshkin, Maj.-Gen. Korchikov, Maj.-Gen. Turchinsky, Maj.-Gen. Vekhin, Col. Antonov, Col. Ivanov, Col. Gervasiyev, Col. Solovyev, Col. Shishkov, Maj.-Gen. Fomishenko, Col. Smolin, Col. Vorobyev, Col. Marchenko, Col. Negoda, Col. Assafov, Col. Shatskov and Col. Rybalko; Tankmen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Tank Troops Bogdanov, Col.-Gen. of Tank Troops Katukov, Col.-Gen. Rybalko, Col.-Gen. Lelyushenko, Col.-Gen. of Tank Troops Novikov, Lt.-Gen. of Tank Troops Orel, Lt.-Gen. Radzievsky, Lt.-Gen. of Tank Troops Krivoshein, Lt.-Gen. of Tank Troops Sukhov, Lt.-Gen. of Tank Troops Belov, Lt.-Gen. Shalin, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Bakhmetyev, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Upman, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Saminov, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Saminov, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Stogny, Maj.-Gen. Dremov, Lt.-Gen. of Tank Troops Kirichenko, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Yushchuk, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Mitrofanov, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Vainrub, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Anisimov, Col. Nikolayev and Col. Babadzhanyan; Artillerymen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Artillery Kazakov, Col.-Gen. of Artillery Varentsov, Lt.-Gen. of Artillery Shamshin, Lt.-Gen. of Artillery Pozharsky, Lt.-Gen. of Artillery Ignatov, Lt.-Gen. of Artillery Romanovich, Lt.-Gen. of Artillery Kozhukhov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Morozov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Kossenko, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Plaskov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Frolov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Likhachev, Maj.-

Gen. of Artillery Snegurov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Lebedevsky, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Koznov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Bryukhanov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Shlepin, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Bogdan, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Seredin, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Kamensky, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Polosukhin, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Petropavlovsky, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Nikolsky, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Mentyukov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Dobrinsky, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Krasnokutsky, Col. Fantalov, Col. Shasko, Col. Korchagin, Col. Overchenko and Col. Lyubimov; Ships and units of the Red Banner Dnieper Flotilla commanded by Rear-Admiral Grigoryev and Capt. of the 1st Rank Lyalko; Airmen commanded by Chief Marshal of Aviation Novikov, Chief Marshal of Aviation Golovanov, Col.-Gen. of Aviation Rudenko, Col.-Gen. of Aviation Krasovsky, Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Savitsky, Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Beletsky, Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Tupikov, Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Loginov, Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Shchetchikov, Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Nestertsev, Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Ryazanov, Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Utin, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Tokarev, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Krupsky, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Korevatsky, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Skok, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Sidnev, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Dzusov, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Slyusarev, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Babaluyev, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Arkhangelsky, Col. Nikishin, Col. Stalin, Col. Pokryshin, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Komarov and Col. Alexandrovich; Sappers commanded by Col.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Proshlyakov, Col.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Galitsky, Maj.

-Gen. of Engineering Troops Marin, Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Tkachenko, Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Furs, Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Kharchevin, Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Zhirov, Col. Belsky, Col. Kamenchuk and Col. Poluektov; Signallers commanded by Lt.-Gen. of Signals Troops Maximenko, Lt.-Gen. of Signals Troops Bulychev, Maj.-Gen. of Signals Troops Bulychev, Maj.-Gen. of Signals Troops Akimov, Col. Cherkasov, Col. Falin, Col. Smoliy, Col. Zakharov, Col. Plotkin, Col. Borissov, Col. Ostrenko, Lt.-Col. of State Security Vakish and Lt.-Col. of State Security Grib.

To commemorate the victory, the units and formations which particularly distinguished themselves in the fighting for the capture of Berlin will be recommended for conferment of the name "Berlin" and award of orders.

Today, May 2, at 23.30 hours (Moscow time), in honour of the historic event of the capture of Berlin by Soviet troops, the capital of our Motherland, Moscow, in the name of the Motherland, will salute with 24 artillery salvoes from 324 guns the gallant troops of the 1st Byelorussian and 1st Ukrainian Fronts.

For excellent military operations I express my thanks to the troops of the 1st Byelorussian and 1st Ukrainian Fronts which took part in the fighting for the capture of Berlin.

Eternal glory to the heroes who fell in the fighting for the freedom and independence of our Motherland! Death to the German invaders!

J. STALIN

Supreme Commander-in-Chief,
Marshal of the Soviet Union.
Moscow.

("Stalin's War Speeches, etc. P. 131)

ORDER OF THE DAY, NO. 364, OF MAY 7,1945

Issued by Marshal Stalin and addressed to the Commander of the Troops of the 1st Ukrainian Front, Marshal Koniev, and the Chief of Staff of the Front, Army-Gen. Petrov.

The Order states that on May 7, troops of the 1st Ukrainian Front, as a result of a long siege, completely captured the city and fortress of Breslavl (Breslau).

The German garrison defending the city, headed by the Commandant of the fortress, Infantry General von Niehof and his staff, ceased resistance, laid down their arms and surrendered.

By 19.00 hours (Moscow time) on May 7, the Soviet troops had taken prisoner in Breslavl more than 40,000 German officers and men.

The Order mentions 59 commanders of troops, tankmen, artillerymen, airmen, sappers and signallers whose units and formations distinguished themselves.

A salute of 12 salvoes was fired from 224 Moscow guns.

("Soviet War News," No. 1153)

ORDER OF THE DAY, NO. 365, OF MAY 8,1945

Issued by Marshal Stalin and addressed to the Commander of the Troops of the 4th Ukrainian Front, Army-Gen. Yeremenko, and the Chief of Staff of the Front, Col.-Gen. Sandalov.

The Order states that on May 8, troops of the 4th Ukrainian Front, continuing their offensive, after stubborn fighting captured the town and large railway junction of Olomouc,an important German defence strongpoint on the Morava River.

The Order mentions 105 commanders of troops, artillerymen, tankmen, airmen, sappers and signallers whose units and formations distinguished themselves.

A salute of 12 salvoes was fired from 124 Moscow guns.

("Soviet War News," No. 1153)

ORDER OF THE DAY, NO. 366, OF MAY 8,1945

Issued by Marshal Stalin and addressed to the Commander of the Troops of the 1st Ukrainian Front, Matshal Koniev, and the Chief of Staff of the Front, Army-Gen. Petrov.

The Order states that on May 8, troops of the 1st Ukrainian Front, after two days fighting, smashed enemy resistance and captured the city of Dresden, an important road junction and pow-

erful German defence strongpoint in Saxony.

The Order mentions 70 commanders of troops, tankmen, artillerymen, airmen, sappers and signallers whose units and formations distinguished themselves.

A salute of 20 salvoes was fired from 224 Moscow guns.

("Soviet War News," No. 1153)

ORDER OF THE DAY, NO. 367, OF MAY 8,1945

Issued by Marshal Stalin and addressed to the Commander of the Troops of the 2nd Ukrainian Front, Marshal Malinovsky, and the Chief of Staff of the Front, Col.-Gen. Zakharov.

The Order states that on May 8, troops of the 2nd Ukrainian Front captured in Czechoslovakia the towns of Jaromerice and Znojmo, and in Austria the towns of Hollabrunn and Stockerau, important communications centres and powerful German defence strongpoints.

The Order mentions 101 commanders of troops, artillerymen, tankmen, airmen, sappers and signallers whose units and formations distinguished themselves.

A salute of 20 salvoes was fired from 224 Moscow guns.

("Soviet War News," No. 1153)

ORDER OF THE DAY, NO. 368, OF MAY 9,1945

Addressed to the Commander of the Troops of the 1st Ukrainian Front, Marshal Koniev, and to the Chief of Staff of the Front, Army-Gen. Petrov.

Troops of the 1st Ukrainian Front, as a result of a vigorous night manoeuvre by tank formations and infantry, crushed the enemy's resistance and today, May 9, liberated from the German invaders the capital of our Ally, Czechoslovakia, Prague.

In the fighting for the liberation of Prague, distinction was won by troops commanded by Col.-Gen. Gordov, Col.-Gen. Pukhov, Col.-Gen. Zhadov, Lt.-Gen. Malandin, Maj.-Gen. Lyamin, Col. Belinsky, Lt.-Gen. Cherokhmenov, Lt.-Gen. Puzikov, Maj.-Gen. Bakanov, Col. Ivanov, Maj.-Gen. Orlov, Maj.-Gen. Danilovsky, Maj.-Gen. Volkovich and Maj.-Gen. Krasnov;Tankmen commanded by Col.-Gen. Lelyushenko, Col.-Gen. Rybalko, Col.-Gen. of Tank Troops Novikov, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Upman, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Bakhmetyev, Lt.-Gen. of Tank Troops Belov, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Yermakov, Col. Pushkarev, Col. Khmulov, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Mitrofan, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Novikov, Lt.-Gen. of Tank Troops Sukhov, Lt.-Col. Karnyushkin,Lt.-Col. Shcherbak, Col. Selivanchik and Col. Turkin; Artillerymen commanded by Col.-Gen.of Artillery Varentsov, Lt.-Gen. of Artillery Kozhukov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Dobrinsky, Maj.-Gen.of Artillery

Krasnokutsky, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Mentyukov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Nikolsky, Lt.-Gen.of Artillery Kubeyev, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Poluyektov and Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Dzevulsky; Airmen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Aviation Krassovsky, Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Ryazanov, Col.Nikishin,Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Arkhangelsky, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Zabaluev, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Slusarev and Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Utin; Sappers commanded by Col.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Galitsky, Col. Poluektov, Col. Kamenchuk, Col. Kordyukov, Lt.-Col. Skorokhod and Lt.-Col. Sobolev; and Signallers commanded by Lt.-Gen. of Signals Troops Bulychev, Maj.-Gen. of Signals Troops Akhremenko, Col. Ostrenko, Col. Borisov, Col. Simkhovich and Col. Bogomolov.

To commemorate the victory the units and formations which particularly distinguished themselves in the fighting for the liberation of Prague shall be recommended for conferment of the name "Prague" and for award of orders.

Today,May 9,at 20.00 hours (Moscow time), the capital of our Motherland, Moscow,on behalf of the Motherland, shall salute with 24 artillery salvoes from 324 guns the gallant troops of the 1st Ukrainian Front which liberated the capital of our Ally Czechoslovakia, Prague.

For excellent military operations I express my thanks to the troops under your command which took part in the fighting for the liberation of Prague.

Eternal glory to the heroes who fell in the

fighting for the freedom and independence of our Motherland and of the Czechoslovak Republic!

Death to the German invaders!

J. STALIN

Supreme Commander-in-Chief,
Marshal of the Soviet Union.
Moscow.

("Stalin's War Speeches, etc." p. 134)

ORDER OF THE DAY, NO. 369, MAY 9, 1945
Addressed to the Red Army and Navy.

On May 8, 1945, in Berlin, representatives of the German High Command signed the instrument of unconditional surrender of the German armed forces.

The Great Patriotic War which the Soviet people waged against the German-fascist invaders is victoriously concluded. Germany is utterly routed.

Comrades, Red Army men, Red Navy men, sergeants, petty officers, officers of the army and navy, generals, admirals and marshals, I congratulate you upon the victorious termination of the Great Patriotic War.

To mark complete victory over Germany, today, May 9, the day of victory, at 22.00 hours (Moscow time), the capital of our Motherland, Moscow, on behalf of the Motherland, shall salute the gallant troops of the Red Army, the ships and units of the Navy, which have won this brilliant victory, by firing 30 artillery salvoes from 1,000 guns.

Eternal glory to the heroes who fell in the fighting for the freedom and independence of the Motherland!

Long live the victorious Red Army and Navy!

J. STALIN
Supreme Commander-in-Chief,
Marshal of the Soviet Union.
Moscow.

("Stalin's War Speeches, etc." P. 135)

VICTORY SPEECH

Broadcast from Moscow at 20.00 hours (Moscow time) on May 9, 1945.

Comrades! Men and women compatriots!

The great day of victory over Germany has come. Fascist Germany, forced to her knees by the Red Army and the troops of our Allies,has acknowledged herself defeated and declared unconditional surrender.

On May 7, the preliminary protocol on surrender was signed in the city of Rheims. On May 8, representatives of the German High Command, in the presence of representatives of the Supreme Command of the Allied Troops and the Supreme Command of the Soviet Troops, signed in Berlin the final act of surrender,the execution of which began at 24.00 hours on May 8.

Being aware of the wolfish habits of the German ringleaders, who regard treaties and agreements as empty scraps of paper, we have no reason to trust their words.However,this morning, in pursuance of the act of surrender, the German troops began to lay down their arms and surrender to our troops en masse. This is no longer an empty scrap of paper. This is actual surrender of Germany's armed forces. True, one group of German troops in the area of Czechoslovakia is still evading surrender. But I trust that the Red Army will be able to bring it to its senses.

Now we can state with full justification that the historic day of the final defeat of Germany, the day of the great victory of our people over German imperialism has come.

The great sacrifices we made in the name of the freedom and independence of our Motherland, the incalculable privations and sufferings experienced by our people in the course of the war, the intense work in the rear and at the front, placed on the altar of the Motherland, have not been in vain, and have been crowned by complete victory over the enemy. The age-long struggle of the Slav peoples for their existence and their independence has ended in victory over the German invaders and German tyranny.

Henceforth the great banner of the freedom of the peoples and peace among peoples will fly over Europe.

Three years ago Hitler declared for all to hear that his aims included the dismemberment of the Soviet Union and the wresting from it of the Caucasus, the Ukraine, Byelorussia, the Baltic lands and other areas. He declared bluntly: "We

will destroy Russia so that she will never be able to rise again." This was three years ago. However, Hitler's crazy ideas were not fated to come true - the progress of the war scattered them to the winds. In actual fact the direct opposite of the Hitlerites' ravings has taken place. Germany is utterly defeated. The German troops are surrendering. The Soviet Union is celebrating Victory, although it does not intend either to dismember or to destroy Germany.

Comrades! The Great Patriotic War has ended in our complete victory. The period of war in Europe is over. The period of peaceful development has begun.

I congratulate you upon victory, my dear men and women compatriots!

Glory to our heroic Red Army which upheld the independence of our Motherland and won victory over the enemy!

Glory to our people, the people victorious!

Eternal glory to the heroes who fell in the struggle against the enemy and gave their lives for the freedom and happiness of our people!

("Stalin's War Speeches, etc." P. 135)

LETTER TO THE AUSTRIAN CHANCELLOR K. RENNER

May 1945

To His Excellency, Mr. K. Renner,

Thank you very much, Comrade, for your letter of April 15. Do not doubt that your worries about the independence, security and progress of Austria are also my worries.

I am prepared to give any help that is necessary for Austria.

Please excuse my delayed answer.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," No. 205, 2 September, 1945)

REPLY TO "THE TIMES" MOSCOW CORRESPONDENT'S QUESTION CONCERNING THE 16 ARRESTED POLISH DIVERSIONISTS

Letter from Mr. Ralph Parker, "The Times" correspondent in Moscow, to the Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R. J.V. Stalin.

The foreign Press has printed a report that several Poles who, according to the recent "Tass" statement, had been arrested on the charge of the organization and carrying out of diversionist actions in the rear of the Red Army, in reality were members of a delegation invited to conduct negotiations with the Soviet authorities. It has also been reported that this group of Poles includes democratic leaders whose opinion on the formation of the future Polish Government would have made a valuable contribution to the formation of such a Government. It has also been reported that by the arrest of these Poles the Soviet Government undermines confidence in the measures adopted in the Crimea, and hinders the

formation of a new Polish Provisional Government.

Would you care to make a statement on this question in order to clarify public opinion, which is interested in this question?

Yours respectfully,
Ralph Parker.

Moscow, May 11, 1945.

J. V. Stalin addressed the following reply to Mr. Parker:

I have somewhat delayed my answer, but this is understandable if one keeps in mind how busy I am.

1. The arrest of the sixteen Poles in Poland headed by the well-known diversionist General Okulicki has no connection with the question of the reconstruction of the Polish Provisional Government. These "gentlemen" were arrested in accordance with the law protecting the Red Army rear from diversionists - a law similar to the British Defence of the Realm Act. The arrests were carried out by Soviet military authorities in accordance with an agreement concluded between the Polish Provisional Government and the Soviet Military Command.

2. It is untrue that the arrested Poles were invited for negotiations with the Soviet authorities. The Soviet authorities do not and will not conduct negotiations with those who break the law on the protection of the Red Army rear.

3. As far as the question of the reorganization of the Polish Provisional Government itself is concerned, it can only be solved on the basis of the Crimea decisions, because no deviation from these decisions can be permitted.

4. I think the Polish question can be solved by agreement between the Allies only if the following elementary conditions are observed:

a) If in the reconstruction of the Polish Provisional Government the latter is recognized as the basic core of the future Polish Government of National Unity, similar to the case of Yugoslavia, where the National Liberation Committee was recognized as the basic core of the United Yugoslav Government;

b) If as a result of the reconstruction a Government is created in Poland which will pursue a policy of friendship with the Soviet Union, and not the policy of the "cordon sanitaire" against the Soviet Union;

c) If the question of the reconstruction of the Polish Government is resolved together with the Poles who now have ties with the Polish people, and not without them.

Yours respectfully,
J. Stalin.

Moscow, May 18, 1945.

("Stalin's War Speeches, etc." P. 137)

TOAST TO THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE AT A RECEPTION IN HONOUR OF THE RED ARMY COMMANDERS GIVEN BY THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT IN THE KREMLIN

Thursday, May 24, 1945

Comrades! Permit me to propose one more, last toast.

I should like to propose a toast to the health of our Soviet people,and in the first place the Russian people. (Loud and prolonged applause and shouts of "Hurrah.")

I drink in the first place to the health of the Russian people because it is the most outstanding nation of all the nations forming the Soviet Union.

I propose a toast to the health of the Russian people because it has won in this war universal recognition as the leading force of the Soviet Union among all the peoples of our country.

I propose a toast to the health of the Russian people not only because it is the leading people, but also because it possesses a clear mind, a staunch character and patience.

Our Government made not a few errors, we experienced at moments a desperate situation in 1941-1942, when our Army was retreating,abandoning our own villages and towns of the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Moldavia,the Leningrad region, the Baltic area and the Karelo-Finnish Republic, abandoning them because there was no other way

out. A different people could have said to the Government "You. have failed to justify our expectations. Go away.We shall install another Government which will conclude peace with Germany and assure us a quiet life." The Russian people, however, did not take this path because it trusted the correctness of the policy of its Government, and it made sacrifices to ensure the rout of Germany. This confidence of the Russian people in the Soviet Government proved to be that decisive force which ensured the historic victory over the enemy of humanity - over fascism.

Thanks to it, the Russian people, for this confidence!

To the health of the Russian people! (Loud and prolonged applause.)

("Stalin's War Speeches, etc." P. 138)

LETTER TO GENERAL DE GAULLE

June 1945.

The French regiment, Normandie-Niemen, returns to its country equipped, that is to say, with its aeroplanes fully equipped, and for its itinerary will follow the Elbe in a westerly direction.

I thought it essential to bestow on the regiment the materials which it has courageously utilized, and with much success, on the oriental front. May these materials be a modest present

from the Soviet Union aviation to France, and the symbol of the friendship between our two peoples.

I beg you to accept my thanks for the work that this regiment has done on the front in the battle against the German armies.

J. STALIN

("Soviet News," No. 46, Paris. June 1945)

TO THE EDITORIAL STAFF OF THE PAPER "PIONERSKAYA PRAVDA"

June 1945.

I warmly congratulate the editorial staff, the young correspondents and the readers of the paper for the twenty years of the "Pionerskaya Pravda".

The "Pionerskaya Pravda"helps Soviet children to acquire knowledge, it educates pioneers and school-children in the spiritual precepts of our great educator, Lenin.

I wish "Pionerskaya Pravda" further success in the education of young Leninists in a devoted spirit towards our Motherland.

J. STALIN

("Pravda," 10 June, 1945)

TO THE ARTILLERY FACTORY IN THE URALS

June 1945.

I congratulate you, the collective of men and women workers, technical engineering workers and employees at the Artillery Factory in the Urals, for the great victory in production: the exportation of 30,000 canon; and for this the factory is awarded the Order of the Patriotic War - First Degree.

Thanks to the courageous spirit of innovation and to the putting into effect of an advanced technique of mechanical construction in the production of artillery, the Artillery Factory, founded in the days of the Patriotic War, has become the chief base for the exportation of artillery armaments far more powerful and elaborate, surpassing the enemy's technique, with which our valiant Red Army has ensured the complete victory against fascist Germany.

I wish you in the future, during the period of peaceful construction, further success in the cause of the exportation of artillery armaments and equipment for the coal-mining and oil industries of our country.

J. STALIN

("Pravda," 22 June, 1945)

ORDER OF THE DAY, NO. 370, JUNE 22, 1945

To commemorate the victory over Germany in the Great Patriotic War, I order a parade of troops of the Army in the Field, of the Navy and of the Moscow Garrison - a Victory Parade - to be held in the Red Square in Moscow on June 24, 1945.

The following units are to take part in the parade: combined regiments of the fronts,a combined regiment of the People's Commissariat for Defence, a combined regiment of the Navy, the military academies, military schools and troops of the Moscow Garrison.

The Victory Parade is to be taken by my Deputy, Marshal of the Soviet Union Zhukov.

Marshal of the Soviet Union Rokossovsky will command the Parade.

I entrust the general direction of the organization of the Parade to the Commander of the troops of the Moscow Military Area and Commander of the Moscow Garrison, Colonel-Gen. Artemyev.

J. STALIN

Supreme Commander-in-Chief,
Marshal of the Soviet Union.
Moscow.

("Stalin's War Speeches, etc." P. 139)

SPEECH AT A RECEPTION IN THE KREMLIN

June 25, 1945.

Do not imagine that I am going to tell you anything extraordinary. The toast that I wish to raise is as simple as it is informal. I would like to drink to the health of those on the lower echelons whose conditions are little envied, to those who are considered as the "screws" of the immense machine of the government but without whom, all of us marshals or commanding officers of the fronts or armies wouldn't be worth, if I may so express it, a jot. Because it requires only for one screw to disappear and all is finished. I drink to the health of simple folk, ordinary and modest, the "screws" which ensure the functioning of our enormous state machine in all its aspects: science, economy, war. They are numerous and their name is legion because they comprise dozens of millions. These are modest people, no-one writes about them,their situation is mediocre and their status is low, but these people support us as the base supports the summit. I drink to the health of these people, our most respected comrades.

J. STALIN

("Pravda," 27 June, 1945)

ORDER OF THE DAY, NO. 371, JULY 22, 1945

Issued by Marshal Stalin and addressed to the troops of the Red Army and the Red Navy.

During the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet people against fascist Germany, our Red Navy has been a faithful helper of the Red Army.

In the war against the U.S.S.R., fascist Germany, relying on the suddenness of their attack and the strength of their well practised army, tried to beat our army and our navy in a shorter time. It was by combining her army with her airforce and her navy, that Germany wanted to realise her domination over the seas.

It is well known that the strategy of the Germans on land and at sea went hopelessly wrong. The Red Army, together with our Allies, routed the Hitlerites and forced them to capitulate.

In both the defensive and offensive fighting of our Red Army, our Navy was a dependable cover for the flanks of our Red Army pushing through to the sea, blocking the enemy's merchant shipping and strategically important navigation routes, securing the uninterrupted functioning of our lines of communication. The fighting action of the Soviet Navy is illustrated through its self-sacrificing steadfastness and valour, its intense combat activity and military skill. The submarine men, the sailors, the naval airmen, artillerymen and infantry have taken over and further developed everything that was so valuable in the hundreds of years of tradition of the Russian Navy.

The Soviet sailors have in the four years of war, on the Baltic Sea, the Black Sea and the Barents Sea, on the Volga, the Danube and the Dnieper, added new pages to the glorious history of the Russian Navy. The Navy has more than fulfilled its duty to the Soviet Motherland.

Comrades sailors, commanders and officers!

The Soviet people want to see their Navy even stronger and more powerful. Our people will produce more warships and bases for the Navy. The task of the Navy is to educate inexperienced marine cadres, to perfect them, to help them to make the fighting experience of the Patriotic War, and maritime, their own, and to increase even more the discipline and organization within their ranks.

I congratulate you on this Day of the Red Navy of the U.S.S.R.

Long live the Red Navy of the U.S.S.R. and its heroic men.

J. STALIN

Supreme Commander-in-Chief,
Marshal of the Soviet Union.

("On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union," German Edition)

TO THE PRIME MINISTER OF MONGOLIA

August, 1945.

I thank you with all my heart for your congratulations upon our total victory over the Japanese aggressors and in turn, I congratulate you on the victory.

The Soviet Government acknowledges with gratitude that the People's Revolutionary Army of Mongolia, fighting side by side with the Red Army, has brought an invaluable contribution to the communal cause of the defeat of Japanese imperialism.

I am sure that in the future the Soviet Union and the People's Revolutionary Army of independent Mongolia will also go forward hand in hand to the struggle against the enemies of our countries, for the well-being of our peoples.

J. STALIN

("Pravda," 29 August, 1945)

TO CHIANG KAI SHEK

August 18, 1945.

Thank you for your greetings and for the important support you gave the Soviet Union regarding the defeat of the Japanese aggressors. The surrender of Japan together with Germany has terminated the second World War, and proves that humanity is indebted to the close military co-operation of the Allies for the defeat of the aggressors in the West and in the East. This victory is of historic and global significance in as much as it is a great, enlightened forward step in the progressive development of humanity.

I express the conviction that the friendship and co-operation of our countries with all freedom-loving nations will serve the cause of universal peace and the prosperity of all peoples.

J. STALIN

("Pravda," 19 August, 1945)

ORDER OF THE DAY, NO. 51, AUGUST 19,1945

In the Great War of the Soviet Motherland against fascist Germany, our airforce fulfilled their task with pride.

The mighty falcon of our Motherland smashed the famous German airforce in a bitter battle in the skies, through which the action of the Red Army liberated the entire population from the (air) bombardments of the enemy.

Together with the entire Red Army, they led a deadly fight against the enemy and smashed its soldiers and its great war machines. The finely detailed operations of our heroic airforce helped the land army continuously in their successes, all of which led to the final capitulation of the enemy.

The Soviet pilots played no small part in the struggle for the liberation and independence of our Motherland. With their single-mindedness and extraordinary determination, they were courageous heroes. They have written more glorious pages in the history of our Motherland.

The victorious Soviet people are justly proud of the struggle they put up.

In the course of the war, it is thanks to the ceaseless efforts of the workers, both men and women, the engineers, the research and talents of all who worked on the construction of the aeroplanes in the Soviet Union, that made it possible for our airforce to organize,with thousands of excellent fighter planes, the smashing of our enemy.

Comrade pilots, navigation officers and ground workers, radio and motor, weapon maintainers, mechanics, technicians and engineers, officers and generals, workers, administration and construction, in the aeroplane industry!

I greet you and congratulate you on this celebration day of the airforce! To celebrate this day of the airforce, and to honour our brave pilots, I order:

Today, August 19, at 20.00 hours, in the capital city of our Motherland, in Moscow, in the name of our homeland, our heroic airforce shall be saluted with 20 artillery shots from 224 canons.

J. STALIN

("On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union," German Edition)

TO CHIANG KAI SHEK

August 31, 1945.

Thank you for your congratulations on the occasion of the ratification of the Treaty of Friendship and Alliance as well as the agreements between China and the U.S.S.R., signed on August 14.

I am sure that this Treaty and the agreements will provide a solid base for an ultimate development of friendly relations between the U.S.S.R. and China for the well-being and prosperity of our peoples and the reinforcement of

peace and security in the Far East and in the whole world.

I beg you, Mr. President, to accept my congratulations on the occasion of the confirmation of these historical documents.

J. STALIN

("Pravda," 31 August, 1945)

STALIN'S ADDRESS TO THE PEOPLE

September 2, 1945.

Comrades! Fellow countrymen and countrywomen!

Today, September 2, political and military representatives of Japan signed an act of unconditional surrender. Utterly defeated on sea and land, and completely surrounded by the armed forces of the United Nations, Japan has admitted defeat and has laid down her arms.

Two hotbeds of world fascism and world aggression had been formed on the eve of the present World War: Germany in the West and Japan in the East. It was they who unleashed the Second World War. It was they who brought mankind and civilization to the brink of doom. The hotbed of world aggression in the West was destroyed four months ago and, as a result, Ger-

many was forced to capitulate. Four months later the hotbed of aggression in the East was destroyed and as a result, Japan, Germany's principal ally, was also compelled to sign an act of capitulation.

This signifies the end of the Second World War.

Now we can say that the conditions necessary for peace all over the world have been gained.

It must be observed that the Japanese aggressors inflicted damage not only on our Allies - China, the U.S.A. and Great Britain. They also inflicted extremely grave damage on our country. That is why we have a seperate account to settle with Japan.

Japan commenced her aggression against our country as far back as 1904,during the Russo -Japanese War. As we know, in February 1904, when negotiations between Japan and Russia were still proceeding, Japan, taking advantage of the weakness of the tsarist government, suddenly and perfidiously, without declaring war, fell upon our country and attacked the Russian fleet in the region of Port Arthur with the object of putting a number of Russian warships out of action and thereby creating an advantageous position for her fleet. She did, indeed, put out of action three Russian first-class warships. It is characteristic that 37 years later Japan played exactly the same perfidious trick against the United States when, in 1941, she attacked the United States naval base in Pearl Harbour and put a number

of American battleships out of action. As we know, in the war against Japan, Russia was defeated. Japan took advantage of the defeat of tsarist Russia to seize from Russia the southern part of Sakhalin and establish herself on the Kuril Islands, thereby putting the lock on all our country's outlets to the ocean in the East, which meant also all outlets to the ports of Soviet Kamchatka and Soviet Chukotka. It was obvious that Japan was aiming to deprive Russia of the whole of her Far East.

But this does not exhaust the list of Japan's aggressive operations against our country. In 1918, after the Soviet system was established in our country, Japan, taking advantage of the hostility then displayed towards the Land of the Soviets by Great Britain, France and the United States, and leaning upon them, again attacked our country, occupied the Far East and for four years tormented our people and looted the Soviet Far East.

Nor is this all. In 1938 Japan attacked our country again, in the region of Lake Hasan, near Vladivostok, with the object of surrounding Vladivostok; and in the following year Japan repeated her attack in another place, in the region of the Mongolian People's Republic, near Khalkin-gol, with the object of breaking into Soviet territory, severing our Siberian Railway and cutting off the Far East from Russia.

True, Japan's attacks in the regions of Hasan and Khalkin-gol were liquidated by the Soviet troops, to the extreme humiliation of the Japan-

ese. Japanese military intervention in 1918-1922 was liquidated with equal success and Japanese invaders were expelled from our Far Eastern regions. But the defeat of the Russian troops in 1904 during the Russo-Japanese War left bitter memories in the minds of our people. It lay like a black stain on our country. Our people believed in and waited for the day when Japan would be defeated and the stain would be wiped out. We of the older generation waited for this day for forty years, and now this day has arrived. Today Japan admitted defeat and signed an act of unconditional surrender.

This means that the southern part of Sakhalin and the Kuril Islands revert to the Soviet Union and henceforth will serve not as a barrier between the Soviet Union and the ocean and as a base for Japanese attack upon our Far East but as a direct means of communication between the Soviet Union and the ocean and a base for the defence of our country against Japanese aggression.

Our Soviet people spared neither strength nor labour for the sake of victory.We experienced extremely hard years. But now everyone of us can say: We have won. Henceforth we can regard our country as being free from the menace of German invasion in the West and of Japanese invasion in the East. The long awaited peace for the peoples of all the world has come.

I congratulate you, my dear fellow countrymen and country-women, on this great victory, on the successful termination of the war, and

on the ushering in of peace all over the world!

Glory to the armed forces of the Soviet Union, the United States of America, China and Great Britain which achieved victory over Japan!

Glory to our Far Eastern troops and our Pacific Fleet, which upheld the honour and dignity of our country!

Glory to our great people, the victorious people!

Eternal glory to the heroes who fell fighting for the honour and victory of our country!

May our country flourish and prosper!

("Soviet Calendar 1917 - 1947")

ORDER OF THE DAY;NO.373,SEPTEMBER 3,1945

On September 2, 1945, in Tokyo, representatives of Japan signed the document of unconditional surrender of the Japanese forces.

The war which the Soviet people together with our allies made against the last aggressor - Japanese imperialism - has ended victoriously. Japan is defeated and has surrendered.

Comrades of the Red Army, sailors of the Red Navy, Sergeants (First Mates), Officers of the Army and the Navy, General, Admirals and Marshals, I congratulate you on the victorious conclusion of the war against Japan.

In appreciation of the victory over Japan, the whole of the capital of our Motherland, Moscow, will today, September 3,the day of the victory over Japan, salute at 21.00 hours, in the

name of our country, the glorious troops of the Red Army,the ships and formations of the Navy, which have achieved this victory, with 24 artillery salvoes from 324 canons.

To the eternal glory of the heroes who fell in the battle for the honour and victory of our homeland!

To the life and progress of our Red Army and our Navy.

J. STALIN

("On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union," German Edition)

SPEECH AT AN ELECTION MEETING

Stalin Election District, Moscow
9 February, 1946

Comrades!

Eight years have passed since the last elections to the Supreme Soviet. This has been a period replete with events of a decisive nature. The first four years were years of intense labour on the part of the Soviet people in carrying out the third Five Year Plan. The second four years covered the events of the war against the German and Japanese aggressors - the events of the second world war. Undoubtedly, the war was the major event of the past period.

It would be wrong to think that the second world war broke out accidentally, or as a result of blunders committed by certain statesmen, although blunders certainly were commit-

ted. As a matter of fact, the war broke out as the inevitable result of the development of world economic and political forces on the basis of present day monopolistic capitalism. Marxists have more than once stated that the capitalist system of world economy contains the elements of universal crises and military conflicts, that, in view of this, the development of world capitalism in our times does not proceed smoothly and evenly, but through crises and war catastrophes. The point is that the uneven development of capitalist countries usually leads, in the course of time, to a sharp disturbance of the equilibrium within the world system of capitalism, and that group of capitalist countries which regards itself as being less securely provided with raw materials and markets usually attempts to change the situation and to redistribute "spheres of influence" in its own favour - by employing armed force. As a result of this, the capitalist world is split into two hostile camps, and war breaks out between them.

Perhaps, war catastrophes could be avoided if it were possible periodically to redistribute raw materials and markets among the respective countries in conformity with their economic weight - by means of concerted and peaceful decisions. But this is impossible under the present capitalist conditions of world economic development.

Thus, as a result of the first crisis of the capitalist system of world economy, the first world war broke out; and as a result of the sec-

ond crisis, the second world war broke out.

This does not mean, of course, that the second world war was a copy of the first. On the contrary, the second world war differed materially in character from the first. It must be borne in mind that before attacking the Allied countries the major fascist states - Germany, Japan and Italy - destroyed the last vestiges of bourgeois-democratic liberties at home and established there a cruel, terroristic regime, trampled upon the principle of sovereignty and free development of small countries, proclaimed as their own the policy of seizing foreign territory and publicly stated that they were aiming at world domination and the spreading of the fascist regime all over the world; and by seizing Czechoslovakia and the central regions of China, the Axis powers showed that they were ready to carry out their threat to enslave all the peace-loving peoples. In view of this, the second world war against the Axis powers, unlike the first world war, assumed from the very outset the character of an anti-fascist war, a war of liberation, one of the tasks of which was to restore democratic liberties. The entry of the Soviet Union into the war against the Axis powers could only augment - and really did augment - the anti-fascist and liberating character of the second world war.

It was on this basis that the anti-fascist coalition of the Soviet Union, the United States of America, Great Britain and other freedom-loving countries came into being and later played the decisive role in defeating the armed forces of the Axis powers.

That is how it stands with the question of the origin and character of the second world war.

Everybody, probably, now admits that the war was not nor could have been an accident in the lives of the peoples, that it actually became a war of the peoples for their existence, and that for that very reason could not have been a swift or lightning war.

As far as our country is concerned, for her this war was the fiercest and most arduous war in the history of our Motherland.

But the war was not only a curse. It was also a great school in which all the forces of the people were examined and tested. The war laid bare all facts and events in the rear and at the front, it ruthlessly tore down all the veils and coverings that concealed the actual features of states, governments and parties, and brought them onto the stage without masks and without make-up, with all their defects and merits. The war was something in the nature of an examination of our Soviet system, of our State, of our government and of our Communist Party; and it summed up their work and said, as it were: Here they are, your people and organizations, their life and work - scrutinize them carefully and treat them according to their deserts.

This is one of the positive sides of the war.

For us, for the voters, this is of immense

importance, for it helps us quickly and impartially to appraise the activities of the Party and its men, and to draw correct conclusions. At another time we would have had to study the speeches and reports of the representatives of the Party, analyze them, compare their words with their deeds, sum up the results, and so forth. This is a complicated and laborious job, and there is no guarantee against mistakes. It is different now, when the war is over, when the war itself has verified the work of our organizations and leaders and has summed it up. It is now much easier to analyze matters, and arrive at correct conclusions.

And so, what are the results of the war?

There is one principal result, upon which all the others rest. This is, that at the end of the war the enemies sustained defeat and we and our Allies proved to be the victors. We terminated the war with complete victory over our enemies - this is the principal result of the war. But this is too general, and we cannot put a full stop here. Of course, to defeat the enemies in a war such as the second world war, the like of which has never been witnessed in the history of mankind before, means achieving a victory of world historical importance. All this is true. But still, it is a general result, and we cannot rest content with it. To appreciate the great historical importance of our victory we must analyze the matter more concretely.

And so, how should our victory over the enemies be interpreted? What can this victory

signify from the point of view of the state and the development of the internal forces of our country?

Our victory signifies, first of all, that our Soviet social system was victorious, that the Soviet social system successfully passed the test of fire in the war and proved that it is fully viable.

As we know, the foreign press on more than one occasion asserted that the Soviet social system was a "risky experiment" that was doomed to failure, that the Soviet system was a "house of cards" having no foundations in life and imposed upon the people by the Cheka, and that a slight shock from without was sufficient to cause this "house of cards" to collapse.

Now we can say that the war has refuted all these asserions of the foreign press and has proved them to have been groundless. The war proved that the Soviet social system is a genuinely people's system, which grew up from the ranks of the people and enjoys their powerful support; that the Soviet social system is a fully viable and stable form of organization of society.

More than that. The issue now is not whether the Soviet social system is viable or not, because after the object lessons of the war, no sceptic now dares to express doubt concerning the viability of the Soviet social system. Now the issue is that the Soviet social system has proved to be more viable and stable than the non-Soviet social system, that the Soviet

social system is a better form of organization of society than any non-Soviet social system.

Secondly, our victory signifies that our Soviet state system was victorious, that our multi-national Soviet state passed all the tests of the war and proved its viability.

As we know, prominent foreign journalists have more than once expressed themselves to the effect that the Soviet multi-national state is an "artificial and short-lived structure," that in the event of any complications arising, the collapse of the Soviet Union would be inevitable, that the Soviet Union would share the fate of Austria-Hungary.

Now we can say that the war refuted these statements of the foreign press and proved them to have been devoid of all foundation. The war proved that the Soviet multi-national state system successfully passed the test, grew stronger than ever during the war, and turned out to be quite a viable state system. These gentlemen failed to realise that the analogy of Austria-Hungary was unsound, becouse our multi-national state grew up not on the bourgeois basis, which stimulates sentiments of national distrust and national enmity, but on the Soviet basis, which, on the contrary, cultivates sentiments of friendship and fraternal cooperation among the peoples of our state.

Incidentally, after the lessons of the war, these gentlemen no longer dare to come out and deny the viability of the Soviet state system. The issue now is no longer the viability of the

Soviet state system, because there can be no doubt about its viability. Now the issue is that the Soviet state system has proved to be a model multi-national state, that the Soviet state system is such a system of state organization in which the national problem and the problem of the cooperation of nations have found a better solution than in any other multi-national state.

Thirdly, our victory signifies that the Soviet armed forces were victorious, that our Red Army was victorious, that the Red Army heroically withstood all the hardships of the war, utterly routed the armies of our enemies, and emerged from the war the victor. (A voice: "Under Comrade Stalin's leadership!" All rise. Loud and prolonged applause, rising to an ovation.)

Now, everybody, friends and enemies alike, admit that the Red Army proved equal to its tremendous task. But this was not the case six years ago, in the period before the war. As we know, prominent foreign journalists, and many recognized authorities on military affairs abroad, repeatedly stated that the condition of the Red Army raised grave doubts, that the Red Army was poorly armed and lacked a proper commanding staff, that its morale was beneath criticism, that while it might be fit for defence, it was unfit for attack, and that, if struck by the German troops, the Red Army would collapse like "a colossus with feet of clay." Such statements were made not only in Germany, but also in France, Great Britain and America.

Now we can say that the war refuted all these statements and proved them to have been groundless and ridiculous. The war proved that the Red Army is not "a colossus with feet of clay," but a first-class modern army, equipped with the most up-to-date armaments, led by most experienced commanders and possessed of high morale and fighting qualities. It must not be forgotten that the Red Army is the army which utterly routed the German army, the army which only yesterday struck terror in the hearts of the armies of the European states.

It must be noted that the "critics" of the Red Army are becoming fewer and fewer. More than that. Comments are more and more frequently appearing in the foreign press noting the high qualities of the Red Army, the skill of its men and commanders, and the flawlessness of its strategy and tactics. This is understandable. After the brilliant victories the Red Army achieved at Moscow and Stalingrad, at Kursk and Belgorod, at Kiev and Kirovograd, at Minsk and Bobruisk, at Leningrad and Tallinn, at Jassy and Lvov, on the Vistula and the Niemen, on the Danube and the Oder and at Vienna and Berlin - after all this, it is impossible not to admit that the Red Army is a first-class army, from which much can be learned. (Loud applause.)

This is how we concretely understand the victory our country achieved over her enemies.

Such, in the main, are the results of the war.

It would be wrong to think that such an

historical victory could have been achieved without the preliminary preparation of the whole country for active defence. It would be no less wrong to assume that such preparation could have been made in a short space of time, in a matter of three or four years. It would be still more wrong to assert that our victory was entirely due to the bravery of our troops. Without bravery it is, of course, impossible to achieve victory. But bravery alone is not enough to overpower an enemy who possesses a vast army, first-class armaments, well-trained officers and fairly well-organized supplies. To withstand the blow of such an enemy, to resist him and then to inflict utter defeat upon him it was necessary to have, in addition to the unexampled bravery of our troops, fully up-to-date armaments, and in sufficient quantities, and well-organized supplies, also in sufficient quantities. But for this it was necessary to have, and in sufficient quantities, elementary things such as: metals - for the production of armaments, equipment and industrial machinery; fuel - to ensure the operation of industry and transport; cotton - to manufacture army clothing; grain - to supply the army with food.

Can it be maintained that before entering the second world war our country already possessed the necessary minimum of the material potentialities needed to satisfy these main requirements? I think it can. To prepare for this immense task we had to carry out three Five Year Plans of national economic development.

It was precisely these three Five Year Plans that enabled us to create these material potentialities. At all events, the situation in our country in this respect was ever so much better before the second world war, in 1940, than it was before the first world war, in 1913.

What were the material potentialities at our country's disposal before the second world war?

To help you to understand this I shall have to make you a brief report on the activities of the Communist Party in the matter of preparing our country for active defence.

If we take the data for 1940 - the eve of the second world war, and compare it with the data for 1913 - the eve of the first world war, we shall get the following picture.

In 1913 there was produced in our country 4,220,000 tons of pig iron, 4,230,000 tons of steel, 29,000,000 tons of coal, 9,000,000 tons of oil, 21,600,000 tons of marketable grain and 740,000 tons of raw ctton.

Such were the material potentialities of our country when she entered the first world war.

This was the economic basis old Russia could utilize for the purpose of prosecuting the war.

As regards 1940, in that year the following was produced in our country: 15,000,000 tons of pig iron, i.e., nearly four times as much as in 1913; 18,300,000 tons of steel, i.e., four and a half times as much as in 1913; 166,000,000 tons

of coal, i.e., five and a half times as much as in 1913; 31,000,000 tons of oil, i.e., three and a half times as much as in 1913; 38,300,000 tons of marketable grain, i.e., 17,000,000 tons more than in 1913; 2,700,000 tons of raw cotton, i.e., three and a half times as much as in 1913.

Such were the material potentialities of our country when she entered the second world war.

This was the economic basis the Soviet Union could utilize for the purpose of prosecuting the war.

The difference, as you see, is colossal.

This unprecedented growth of production cannot be regarded as the simple and ordinary development of a country from backwardness to progress. It was a leap by which our Motherland became transformed from a backward country into an advanced country, from an agrarian into an industrial country.

This historic transformation was brought about in the course of three Five Year Plans, beginning with 1928 - with the first year of the first Five Year Plan period. Up to that time we had to restore our ruined industries and heal the wounds inflicted upon us by the first world war and the Civil War. If we take into consideration the fact that the first Five Year Plan was carried out in four years, and that the execution of the third Five Year Plan was interrupted by war in the fourth year, it works out that the transformation of our country from an agrarian

into an industrial country took only about thirteen years.

It cannot but be admitted that thirteen years is an incredibly short period for the execution of such a gigantic task.

It is this that explains the storm of controversy that broke out in the foreign press at the time these figures were published. Our friends decided that a "miracle" had happened; those who were ill-disposed towards us proclaimed that the Five Year Plans were "Bolshevik propaganda" and "tricks of the Cheka." But as miracles do not happen and the Cheka is not so powerful as to be able to annul the laws of social development, "public opinion" abroad was obliged to resign itself to the facts.

By what policy was the Communist Party able to create these material potentialities in so short a time?

First of all by the Soviet policy of industrializing the country.

The Soviet method of industrializing the country differs radically from the capitalist method of industrialization. In capitalist countries, industrialization usually starts with light industry. In view of the fact that light industry requires less investments, that capital turnover is faster, and profits are made more easily than in heavy industry, light industry becomes the first object of industrialization in those countries. Only after the passage of a long period of time, during which light industry accumulates profits and concentrates them in banks, only

after this does the turn of heavy industry come and accumulations begin gradually to be transferred to heavy industry for the purpose of creating conditions for its development. But this is a long process, which takes a long time, running into several decades, during which you have to wait while the light industry develops and do without heavy industry. Naturally, the Communist Party could not take this path. The Party knew that war was approaching, that it would be impossible to defend our country without heavy industry, that it was necessary to set to work to develop heavy industry as quickly as possible, and that to be belated in this matter meant courting defeat. The Party remembered what Lenin said about it being impossible to protect the independence of our country without heavy industry, and about the likelihood of the Soviet system perishing without heavy industry. The Communist Party of our country therefore rejected the "ordinary" path of industrialization and commenced the industrialization of the country by developing heavy industry. This was a very difficult task, but one that could be accomplished. It was greatly facilitated by the nationalization of industry and the banks, which made it possible quickly to collect funds and transfer them to heavy industry.

There can be no doubt that without this it would have been impossible to transform our country into an industrial country in so short a time.

Secondly, by the policy of collectivizing

agriculture.

To put an end to our backwardness in agriculture and to provide the country with the largest possible amount of marketable grain, cotton, and so forth, it was necessary to pass from small peasant farming to large-scale farming, for only large-scale farming can employ modern machinery, utilize all the achievements of agricultural science and provide the largest possible quantity of marketable produce. But there are two kinds of large-scale farming - capitalist and collective. The Communist Party could not take the capitalist path of developing agriculture not only on grounds of principle, but also because that path presupposes an exceedingly long process of development and calls for the ruination of the peasants and their transformation into agricultural labourers. The Communist Party therefore took the path of collectivizing agriculture, the path of organizing large farms by uniting the peasant farms into collective farms. The collective method proved to be an exceedingly progressive method not only because it did not call for the ruination of the peasants, but also, and particularly, because it enabled us in the course of several years to cover the entire country with large collective farms capable of employing modern machinery, of utilizing all the achievements of agricultural science and of providing the country with the largest possible quantity of marketable produce.

There is no doubt that without the policy of collectivization we would not have been able

to put an end to the age-long backwardness of our agriculture in so short a time.

It cannot be said that the Party's policy met with no resistance. Not only backward people, who always refuse to listen to anything that is new, but even many prominent members of our Party persistently tried to pull our Party back, and by every possible means tried to drag it onto the "ordinary" capitalist path of development. All the anti-Party machinations of the Trotskyites and of the Rights, all their "activities" in sabotaging the measures of our government, pursued the one object of frustrating the Party's policy and of hindering industrialization and collectivization. But the Party yielded neither to the threats of some nor to the howling of others and confidently marched forward in spite of everything. It is to the Party's credit that it did not adjust itself to the backward, that it was not afraid to swim against the current, and that all the time it held onto its position of the leading force. There can be no doubt that if the Communist Party had not displayed this staunchness and perseverance it would have been unable to uphold the policy of industrializing the country and of collectivizing agriculture.

Was the Communist Party able to make proper use of the material potentialities created in this way for the purpose of developing war production and of supplying the Red Army with the armaments it needed?

I think it was, and that it did so with the

utmost success.

Leaving out of account the first year of the war, when the evacuation of industry to the East hindered the work of developing war production, we can say that during the three succeeding years of the war the Party achieved such successes as enabled it not only to supply the front with sufficient quantities of artillery, machine-guns, rifles, aeroplanes, tanks and ammunition, but also to accumulate reserves. Moreover, as is well known, the quality of our armaments was not only not inferior but, in general, even superior to the German.

It is well known that during the last three years of the war our tank industry produced annually an average of over 30,000 tanks, self-propelled guns and armoured cars. (Loud applause.)

It is well known, further, that in the same period our aircraft industry produced annually up to 40,000 aeroplanes.(Loud applause.)

It is also well known that our artillery industry in the same period produced annually up to 120,000 guns of all calibres (loud applause), up to 450,000 light and heavy machine-guns (loud applause), over 3,000,000 rifles (applause) and about 2,000,000 automatic rifles. (Applause.)

Lastly, it is well known that our mortar industry in the period of 1942-44 produced annually an average of up to 100,000 mortars. (Loud applause.)

It goes without saying that simultaneously we produced corresponding quantities of artillery shells, mines of various kinds, air bombs, and

rifle and machine-gun cartidges.

It is well known, for example, that in 1944 alone we produced over 240,000,000 shells, bombs and mines (applause) and 7,400,000,000 cartridges. (Loud applause.)

Such is the general picture of the way the Red Army was supplied with arms and ammunition.

As you see, it does not resemble the picture of the way our army was supplied during the first world war, when the front suffered from a chronic shortage of artillery and shells, when the army fought without tanks and aircraft, and when one rifle was issued for every three men.

As regards supplying the Red Army with food and clothing, it is common knowledge that the front not only felt no shortage whatever in this respect, but even had the necessary reserves.

This is how the matter stands as regards the activities of the Communist Party of our country in the period up to the beginning of the war and during the war.

Now a few words about the Communist Party's plans of work for the immediate future. As you know, these plans are formulated in the new Five Year Plan, which is to be adopted in the very near future. The main tasks of the new Five Year Plan are to rehabilitate the devastated regions of our country, to restore industry and agriculture to the pre-war level, and then to exceed that level to a more or less con-

siderable extent. Apart from the fact that the rationing system is to be abolished in the very near future (loud and prolonged applause), special attention will be devoted to the expansion of the production of consumer goods, to raising the standard of living of the working people by steadily reducing the prices of all commodities (loud and prolonged applause), and to the extensive organization of scientific research institutes of every kind (applause) capable of giving the fullest scope to our scientific forces. (Loud applause.)

I have no doubt that if we give our scientists proper assistance they will be able in the very near future not only to overtake but even outstrip the achievements of science beyond the borders of our country. (Prolonged applause.)

As regards long-term plans, our Party intends to organize another powerful uplift of our national economy that will enable us to raise our industry to a level, say, three times as high as that of pre-war industry. We must see to it that our industry shall be able to produce annually up to 50,000,000 tons of pig iron (prolonged applause), up to 60,000,000 tons of steel (prolonged applause), up to 500,000,000 tons of coal (prolonged applause) and up to 60,000,000 tons of oil (prolonged applause). Only when we succeed in doing that can we be sure that our Motherland will be insured against all contingencies. (Loud applause.) This will need, perhaps, another three Five Year Plan periods, if not more. But it can be done, and we must do it.

This, then, is my brief report on the activities of the Communist Party during the recent past and on its plans of work for the future. (Loud and prolonged applause).

It is for you to judge to what extent the Party has been and is working on the proper lines (applause), and whether it could not have worked better. (Laughter and applause).

It is said that the victors are not judged (laughter and applause), that they must not be criticized, that they must not be inquired into. This is not true. Victors may and should be judged (laughter and applause), they may and should be criticized and inquired into. This is beneficial not only for the cause, but also for the victors (laughter and applause); there will be less swell-headedness, and there will be more modesty. (Laughter and applause.) I regard the election campaign as a court of the voters sitting in judgement over the Communist Party as the ruling party. The result of the election will be the voters' verdict. (Laughter and applause.) The Communist Party of our country would not be worth much if it feared criticism and investigation. The Communist Party is ready to receive the verdict of the voters. (Loud applause.)

In this election contest the Communist Party does not stand alone. It is going to the polls in a bloc with the non-Party people. In the past Communists were somewhat distrustful of non-Party people and of non-Party-ism. This was due to the fact that various bourgeois groups, who thought it was not to their advant-

age to come before the voters without a mask, not infrequently used the non-Party flag as a screen. This was the case in the past. Times are different now. Non-Party people are now seperated from the bourgeoisie by a barrier called the Soviet social system. And on this side of the barrier the non-Party people are united with the Communists in one, common, collective body of Soviet people. Within this collective body they fought side by side to consolidate the might of our country, they fought side by side and shed their blood on the various fronts for the sake of freedom and greatness of our Motherland, and side by side they hammered out and forged our country's victory over her enemies. The only difference between them is that some belong to the Party and some don't. But this difference is only a formal one. The important thing is that all are engaged in one common cause. That is why the Communist and non-Party bloc is a natural and vital thing. (Loud and prolonged applause).

In conclusion, permit me to express my thanks for the confidence which you have shown me (loud and prolonged applause. A voice: "Cheers for the great leader of all our victories, Comrade Stalin!") by nominating me as a candidate for the Supreme Soviet. You need have no doubt that I will do my best to justify your confidence. (All rise. Loud and prolonged applause, rising to an ovation. Voices in different parts of the hall: "Long live great Stalin, Hurrah!" "Cheers for the great leader of the

peoples!" "Glory to great Stalin!" "Long live Comrade Stalin, the candidate of the entire people!" "Glory to the creator of all our victories, Comrade Stalin!")

("Soviet Calendar 1917 - 1947")

ANSWER TO A LETTER OF 30 JANUARY, FROM COL.-PROFESSOR RASIN

On Clausewitz and the questions of war and the art of war.

23 February, 1946.

Dear Comrade Rasin,

I have received your letter of 30 January on Clausewitz and your short thesis on war and the art of war.

1. You ask if Lenin's standpoint on the judgement of Clausewitz is no longer valid.

In my opinion the question is wrongly put.

By putting the question in such a way one could believe that Lenin had analyzed the science of war and the works of Clausewitz, judged them from a military viewpoint, and had left us a number of guidelines on military questions. Putting the question in such a way is wrong because there are no such "Theses" of Lenin on Clausewitz's teachings on the art of war.

Unlike Engels, Lenin did not believe himself to be an expert on military matters, - neither before the October Revolution, nor in the period up to the end of the Civil War.

During the Civil War, Lenin abjured us young comrades on the Central Committee to study the art of war thoroughly. He unhesitatingly declared that it was too late for him to become a military expert. This explains why Lenin, in his judgement on Clausewitz and his remarks on Clausewitz's works, does not touch upon solely military aspects such as questions of military strategy and tactics and their relation to each other, the relation between attack and retreat, defence and counter-offensive and so on.

What was Lenin's interest in Clausewitz and why did he acknowledge him?

Lenin acknowleged Clausewitz who was not a Marxist, and who was recognized as an authority in the field of military theory because in his works he confirmed the known Marxist theory that there is a direct relation between war and politics, that politics can engender war and that war is the continuation of politics by force. Here, Lenin needed Clausewitz to prove that Plekhanov, Kautsky and others had fallen once more into social chauvinism and social imperialism. He further acknowledged Clausewitz in that he confirmed the Marxist viewpoint in his works that under certain unfavourable conditions, - retreat is as justifiable a military action as is attack. Lenin needed Clausewitz to disprove the

theory of the "left" Communists who denied that retreat could be a justifiable military action.

In this way, not as a military expert, but as a politician, Lenin used the works of Clausewitz, and was mainly interested in those questions in the works of Clausewitz which showed the relation between war and politics.

Thus, as successors of Lenin, there are no restrictions on us in the criticism of the military doctrine of Clausewitz, as there are no remarks of Lenin that could hinder us in our free criticism.

Thus, your judgement on the article of Comrade Meshtsherjakov (in "Wojennaja Mysl," No. 6/7, 1945), which criticises the military doctrine of Clausewitz, regarding it as a "Revision" of Lenin's judgement is completely unjustified.

2. Do we have reason at all to criticise the military doctrine of Clausewitz? Yes, we have. In the interests of our cause and the modern science of war, we are obliged not only to criticise Clausewitz, but also Moltke, Schlieffen, Ludendorff, Keitel and other exponents of German military ideology. During the last thirty years Germany has twice forced a bloody war on the rest of the world and twice has suffered defeat. Was this accidental? Of course not. Does this not mean that not only Germany as a whole, but also its military ideology has not stood the test? Obviously. It is well known that the military of the whole world, also our Russian military, looked up to the German military

authorities. Is it not time to put an end to this undeserved respect? Absolutely. So, this can only be done by criticism, especially from our side, especially from the side of those who have won the victory over Germany.

Concerning Clausewitz, as an authority in the field of military authority, he is of course out of date. On the whole, Clausewitz was a representative of the time of manufacture in war, but now we are in the machine age of war. Undoubtedly the machine age of war requires new military ideologies. Thus, it would be ridiculous to follow the teachings of Clausewitz today. One cannot make progress and further science without a critical analysis of the antiquated theories of well known authorities. This applies not only to the authorities in war theory but also to the Marxist classics. Engels once said of the Russian Commanders of 1812, that Gen. Barclay de Tolley was the only one of any relevance. Engels was of course wrong, as Kutusov was of greater importance by far. Nevertheless there are people in our time who did not hesitate to defend this wrong judgement of Engels.

In our criticism we must not be guided by single remarks and judgements from the classics, but must be guided by Lenin's well known guideline:

"We do not regard the theory of Marx as something final and untouchable; on the contrary, we are convinced that it has laid the foundations of that science that the Socialists

must develop in every direction if they do not want to fall back behind the times. We are of the opinion that the Russian Socialists must find their own interpretation of Marxism, as this theory gives only general guidelines, the application of which in detail is different in England than in France; in France, different than in Germany; in Germany, different than in Russia." (Lenin Works, Vol. 4. Moscow 1946. Pp 191-192. Russian Ed.)

Such an attitude is for us even more necessary concerning the authorities of war theory.

3. Concerning your short thesis on war and the art of war, I have to restrict myself to general remarks because of their surface character. The thesis contains too much philosophy and abstract statements. The terminology taken from Clausewitz, talking of the grammar and logic of war hurts ones ears. The question of the factional character of war theory is primitively posed. The hymns of praise to Stalin also pain the ears, it hurts to read them. Also, the chapter on counter-offensive (not to be confused with counter-attack) is missing. I am talking of the counter-offensive after a successful but indecisive enemy offensive, during which the defenders assemble their forces to turn to a counter-offensive and strike a decisive blow to the enemy and inflict defeat upon him. I am of the opinion that a well organized counter-offensive is a very interesting method of offensive. You, as an historian should be interested in this. The old Parthens were already acquainted with such

a counter-offensive when they lured the Roman Commander Crassus and his army into the interior of their country and, turning to counter-offensive, destroyed him and his troops. Our brilliant Commander, Kutusov, executed this when he destroyed Napoleon and his army by a well prepared counter-offensive.

J. STALIN

("New World," No. 7, April 1947. Pp. 23 - 25)

ORDER OF THE DAY OF THE COMMISSAR OF DEFENCE OF THE U.S.S.R., NO. 8

23 February, 1946

Comrades soldiers and sailors of the Red Army and Red Navy, non-commissioned officers, officers and generals!

Today we are celebrating the twenty-eighth anniversary of the existence of the Red Army. The Red Army commemorates its twenty-eighth anniversary in the glow of the glorious victory over the German and Japanese imperialists. Engaged in a prolonged and arduous war, the Red Army has emerged as a first-class army of the highest morale and fighting force, equipped with modern armaments and cadres of great experience, tempered by battle. In the war against the fascist invaders the Red Army has shown its high quality, and it has shown that it is able to defend the interests of the Soviet state effectively, faithfully and staunchly.

Our soldiers, officers and generals have justified the confidence of the people and have shown their great devotion towards our Motherland. The Red Army has proved to the Soviet people that they can have confidence in it. The people of our country have great trust in their army and its victories, and will keep the sacred memory of their heroes who fell in the battles for the Motherland.

The remarkable victories of the Red Army are explained, above all, by the fact that it is a truly popular army that defends the interests of its people. The Soviet people love their army ardently, and are a constant source of its re-inforcement and of its strength. This has been shown especially in the time of the Great Patriotic War. All our people have worked unhesitatingly, day and night, for victory. Without this work, without this self-sacrificing of the workers, peasants and intellectuals, without their material and moral support, the Red Army would not have defeated the enemy.

The victories of the Red Army are also explained by the fact that it was led and educated by the Communist Party. Furthermore, the behests of the great Lenin helped the Soviet people, under the guidance of the Communist Party, to transform our country from a backward land to a land of progress, from an agrarian to an industrial country. On this basis was founded all the material possibilities for the victorious struggle of the Red Army against its enemies. During the Great Patriotic War, the Com-

munist Party united all the countries of the Soviet Union into a single military camp, and has orientated all the efforts of the people and the army towards a single aim - the destruction of the enemy. The Communist Party has educated the Soviet soldier in the sense and aims of the war, it has cultivated love for the Motherland, constantly reinforced their fighting spirit and inspired their staunchness and discipline. All this has created the conditions for our victory.

After the victory over the enemies, the Soviet Union has entered into a new period, into a peaceful period of economic development. The present task of the Soviet people is to assure the conquered positions and to go forward in a new economic effort. We cannot only assure our position as this would mean stagnation; we have to go forward and create the conditions for a new and powerful effort of the national economy. To put it in a word, we have to heal the wounds inflicted on our country by the enemy and reach the pre-war level of the national economy before we can make considerable progress; we have to raise the material well-being of our people and we have to raise the economic and military ability of the Soviet state.

Under these new conditions, the Red Army must vigilantly protect the creative work of the Soviet people, must solidly guarantee the interests of the Soviet Union and protect the borders of our Motherland and make them inaccessible to any enemy.

During the war the main task of the sol-

diers, officers and generals of the Red Army consisted of attaining the victory, to concentrate all their knowledge and efforts on the total annihilation of the enemy. In these peaceful times the prime task of our soldiers, officers and generals, without exception, consists of perfecting their military and political abilities. All our soldiers and non-commissioned officers of the Red Army have to intensively study military art, have to know their weapons well and perform their duty irreproachably. Now, more than ever, the officers have to be able to educate and instruct their subordinates.

During the war the officers and generals of the Red Army knew well how to lead their troops in battle. Now these officers and generals have to become perfect masters in the education and instruction of their troops in present times.

The Great Patriotic War has introduced much that is new in the military art. The combat experience represents a rich treasure for the instruction and education of the troops. That is why all the instruction of the army should be based on the intelligent application of the experiences of the war. It is also necessary to utilize this experience in all fields for the theoretical instruction of the cadres and officers, for the enriching of Soviet military science. One must ensure that the military art develops constantly and swiftly. The Red Army is obliged not only to follow the development of the military art but to further progress it. The

Red Army is equipped with first-class military material which constitutes the basis for its ability in combat. It knows how to handle this equipment perfectly and it treats it as the apple of its eye.

Any successes in the instruction and education of its troops is impossible without without discipline and a strict military order, because the effectiveness of an army depends on this. This applies especially to the adjutants and sergeants who are the immediate superiors and direct teachers of the soldiers of the Red Army. The soldiers, officers and generals of the Red Army have great merit with the people and the Motherland. But they must not become complacent and vain about this, they must not rest upon their laurels, - but they must conscientiously carry out their duties and they must devote all their strength and knowledge to the service of the Red Army. That is what is demanded of all Soviet soldiers.

Comrades soldiers and sailors of the Red Army and Red Navy, non-commissioned officers, oficers and generals! In the name of the Soviet government and our Communist Party, I greet and congratulate you on the occasion of the twenty-eighth anniversary of the Red Army. To celebrate the day of the Red Army, today, 23 February, I order: A salute of twenty artillery salvoes in the capital of our Motherland, Moscow, in the capitals of the federative republics and in the heroic cities of Leningrad, Stalingrad, Sebastopol and Odessa.

Long live our victorious Red Army!
Long live our victorious sailors of the war!
Long live our glorious Communist Party!
Long live the great Soviet people!
Long live our powerful Motherland!

J. STALIN

People's Commissar of Defence of the U.S.S.R., Generalissimo of the Soviet Union.

("Pravda," 23 February, 1946)

DECLARATION OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL OF PEOPLE'S COMMISSARS OF THE U.S.S.R.

15 March, 1946

In relation to the question of the formtion of the government of the U.S.S.R., which was submitted to the examination of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., the Council of People's Commissars regards its obligations as terminated and hands over its power to the Supreme Soviet.

The Council of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R. is at the disposal of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

J. STALIN

President of the Council of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R.

("Zassedanie Verkhovogo Sovieta SSSR," P. 82)

INTERVIEW WITH "PRAVDA" CORRESPONDENT

On Churchill's Speech at Fulton.

13 March, 1946

The other day a "Pravda" correspondent asked Comrade Stalin to clarify a number of questions connected with Mr. Churchill's Speech. Below are given Comrade Stalin's replies to the questions put by the correspondent.

Q. How do you appraise the latest Speech Mr. Churchill delivered in the United States of America?

A. I appraise it as a dangerous act calculated to sow the seeds of discord between the Allied states and hamper their cooperation.

Q. Can Mr. Churchill's Speech be regarded as harmful to the cause of peace and security?

A. Unquestionably, yes. As a matter of fact, Mr. Churchill's position is now that of the incendiaries of war. And Mr. Churchill is not alone in this - he has friends not only in England but in the United States of America as well.

It should be noted that in this respect Mr. Churchill and his friends strikingly resemble Hitler and his friends. Hitler set out to unleash war by proclaiming the race theory, declaring that the German-speaking people constituted a superior nation. Mr. Churchill sets out to unleash war also with a race theory, by asserting that the English-speaking nations are superior nations called upon to decide the destinies of

the entire world. The German race theory led Hitler and his friends to the conclusion that the Germans as the only superior nation must dominate other nations. The English race theory leads Mr. Churchill and his friends to the conclusion that the English-speaking nations, as the only superior nations, must dominate the other nations of the world.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Churchill and his friends in England and the U.S.A. are presenting something in the nature of an ultimatum to nations which do not speak English: recognize our domination voluntarily and then everything will be in order - otherwise war is inevitable.

But the nations shed their blood during five years of fierce war for the sake of the freedom and independence of their countries, and not for the sake of replacing the domination of the Hitlers by the domination of the Churchills. Therefore, it is quite probable that the nations which do not speak English and at the same time constitute the vast majority of the world's population, will not agree to submit to the new slavery.

Mr. Churchill's tragedy is that he, as an inveterate Tory, does not understand this simple and obvious truth.

Undoubtedly, Mr. Churchill's line is that of war, a call to war against the U.S.S.R. It is also clear that this line of Mr. Churchill is incompatible with the existing treaty of alliance between Britain and the U.S.S.R. True, in order to confuse the readers, Mr. Churchill states in pass-

ng that the term of the Soviet-British treaty of mutual assistance and cooperation could perfectly well be extended to fifty years. But how can such a statement by Mr. Churchill be reconciled with his line of war against the U.S.S.R., with his preaching of war against the U.S.S.R? Clearly these things cannot be reconciled by any means. And if Mr. Churchill, who is calling for war against the Soviet Union, at the same time believes it possible to extend the term of the Anglo-Soviet treaty to fifty years, that means that he regards this treaty as a mere scrap of paper which he needs only to cover up and camouflage his anti-Soviet line. Therefore we cannot treat seriously the hypocritical statement of Mr. Churchill's friends in England concerning the extension of the term of the Soviet-British treaty to fifty years or more. The extension of the term of the treaty is meaningless if one of the parties violates the treaty and turns it into a mere scrap of paper.

Q. How do you appraise that part of Mr. Churchill's Speech in which he attacks the democratic system in the European states neighbouring with us and in which he criticizes the good-neighbourly relations established between these states and the Soviet Union?

A. This part of Mr. Churchill's Speech represents a mixture of elements of slander with elements of rudeness and tactlessness.

Mr. Churchill asserts that "Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Bucharest, Sofia - all these famous cities and populations

around them lie within the Soviet sphere and all are subject in one form or another not only to Soviet influence but to a very high and increasing measure of control from Moscow." Mr. Churchill describes all this as boundless "expansionist tendencies" of the Soviet Union.

No special effort is necessary to prove that in this case Mr. Churchill is rudely and shamelessly slandering both Moscow and the above-mentioned states neighbouring with the U.S.S.R.

Firstly, it is utterly absurd to speak of exclusive control of the U.S.S.R. in Vienna and Berlin, where there are Allied Control Councils composed of representatives of the four states and where the U.S.S.R. has only one-fourth of the votes. It does happen that some people cannot help slandering, but even then there should be a limit.

Secondly, one must not forget the following fact. The Germans invaded the U.S.S.R. through Finland, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary. The Germans were able to effect the invasion by way of these countries because at that time governments hostile to the Soviet Union existed in these countries. Owing to the German invasion, the Soviet Union irrevocably lost in battles with the Germans and also as a result of German occupation and the driving off of Soviet people to German penal servitude, some 7,000,000 persons. In other words the Soviet Union lost several times more people than Britain and the United States of America

taken together. Possibly some quarters are inclined to consign to oblivion these colossal sacrifices of the Soviet people which secured the liberation of Europe from the Hitlerite yoke. But the Soviet Union cannot forget them. The question arises, what can there be surprising about the fact that the Soviet Union, desiring to insure its security in the future, seeks to achieve a situation when those countries will have governments maintaining a friendly attitude towards the Soviet Union? How can anyone who has not gone mad describe these peaceful aspirations of the Soviet Union as expansionist tendencies of our state?

Mr. Churchill further states that "the Russian-dominated Polish government has been encouraged to make enormous wrongful inroads upon Germany."

Here every word is rude and offensive slander. Present-day democratic Poland is guided by outstanding men. They have proved by deeds that they are capable of defending the interests and dignity of their homeland in a manner of which their predecessors were not capable. What grounds has Mr. Churchill to assert that the leaders of present-day Poland can permit the "domination" of representatives of any foreign states whatever in their country? Is it not because Mr. Churchill intends to sow the seeds of discord in the relations between Poland and the Soviet Union that he slanders "the Russians" here?....

Mr. Churchill is displeased with the fact

that Poland has effected a turn in her policy towards friendship and alliance with the U.S.S.R. There was a time when elements of conflict and contradiction prevailed in the relations between Poland and the U.S.S.R. That furnished statesmen of Mr. Churchill's kind with an opportunity to play on these contradictions, to lay their hands on Poland under the guise of protecting her from the Russians, to intimidate Russia with the spectre of war between her and Poland, and to reserve the position of arbitrators for themselves. But that time is past, for the enmity between Poland and Russia has yielded place to friendship between them, while Poland, present-day democratic Poland, does not want to be tossed around like a ball by foreigners any longer. It seems to me that it is this very circumstance that irritates Mr. Churchill and impels him to rude, tactless sallies against Poland. It is no joke: he is not allowed to play his game at someone else's expense....

As regards Mr. Churchill's attacks on the Soviet Union in connection with Poland's extending her western frontiers into Polish territories seized by the Germans in the past, here, it seems to me, he is obviously sharping. It is well known that the decision on Poland's western frontiers was adopted at the Berlin Conference of the Three Powers on the basis of Poland's demands. The Soviet Union has repeatedly stated that it regards Poland's demands correct and just. It is quite probable that Mr. Churchill is displeased with that decision. But why then does

Mr. Churchill, while sparing no arrows against the position of the Russians in this matter, conceal from his readers the fact that the decision was adopted at the Berlin Conference unanimously, that not the Russians alone but the British and the Americans too voted for this decision? Why did Mr. Churchill need to mislead people?

Mr. Churchill further asserts that "the Communist parties, which were previously very small in all these eastern states of Europe, have been raised to pre-eminence and power far beyond their numbers, and seek everywhere to obtain totalitarian control. Police governments prevail in nearly every case, and thus far, except in Czechoslovakia, there is no true democracy."

It is well known that in Britain the state is now governed by one party, the Labour Party, while the opposition parties are devoid of the right to participate in the government of Britain. This is what Mr. Churchill calls true democracy. Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Hungary are governed by blocs of several parties - from four to six parties - while the opposition, if it is more or less loyal, is secured the right of participating in the government. This is what Mr. Churchill calls totalitarianism, tyranny, police rule. Why and on what grounds - do not expect an answer from Mr. Churchill. Mr. Churchill does not understand in what a ridiculous position he places himself by his vociferous speeches about totalitarianism, tyranny, police rule.

Mr. Churchill would like Poland to be governed by Sosnkowski and Anders; Yugoslavia by Mikhailovic and Pavelic; Rumania by Prince Stirbei and Radescu; Hungary and Austria by some king of the house of Hapsburgs, and so forth. Mr. Churchill wants to convince us that these gentlemen from the fascist backyard are capable of securing "true democracy." Such is Mr. Churchill's "democracy."

Mr. Churchill is wandering about the truth when he speaks of the growth of the influence of the Communist parties in Eastern Europe. It should be noted, however, that he is not quite accurate. The influence of the Communist parties has grown not only in Eastern Europe but in almost all the countries of Europe where fascism ruled before (Italy, Germany, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Finland), or where German, Italian or Hungarian occupation took place (France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Denmark, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Greece, the Soviet Union, and so forth.)

The growth of the influence of the Communists cannot be regarded as fortuitous. It is a perfectly legitimate phenomenon. The influence of the Communists has grown because in the hard years of fascist domination in Europe the Communists proved reliable, courageous, self-sacrificing fighters against the fascist regime, for the freedom of the peoples. Mr. Churchill sometimes mentions in his speeches "the simple people of cottages," patting them on the back in a lordly manner and posing as their friend. But these people are not so simple as

they may seem at first glance. They, these "simple people," have their own views, their own policy, and they are able to stand up for themselves. It is they, the millions of these "simple people," who voted down Mr. Churchill and his party in England by casting their votes for the Labourites. It is they, the millions of these "simple people," who isolated the reactionaries in Europe, the adherents of collaboration with fascism, and gave preference to the left democratic parties. It is they, the millions of these "simple people," who tested the Communists in the fire of struggle and resistance to fascism and decided that the Communists fully deserve the people's trust. That is how the influence of the Communists has grown in Europe. Such is the law of historical development.

Naturally, Mr. Churchill does not like such a course of development and he sounds the alarm, appealing to force. But he similarly did not like the birth of the Soviet regime in Russia after the First World War. Then too he sounded the alarm and organized the military campaign of "14 states" against Russia, setting himself the goal of turning the wheel of history back. Yet history proved stronger than Churchillian intervention, and Mr. Churchill's quixotic ways brought about his utter defeat. I do not know whether Mr. Churchill and his friends will succeed in organizing after the Second World War a new military campaign against "Eastern Europe." But should they succeed - which is hardly probable, since millions of "simple people" are guarding the cause of peace - one can confidently say that they will be beaten just as they were beaten in the past, twenty-six years ago.

("Soviet Calendar 1917 - 1947")

INTERVIEW WITH THE CORRESPONDENT OF ASSOCIATED PRESS, GILMORE

22 March, 1946

Q. What significance do you believe the United Nations Organization has as a means of maintaining international peace?

A. I think the United Nations Organization is of great importance because it is an important instrument for the maintaining of peace and international security. The strength of this international Organization lies in the principle of the equality of states and not on the domination of some over the rest. If the United Nations Organization manages to maintain the principle of equality it will definitely play a great and positive role in ensuring general peace and security.

Q. In your opinion, what is causing the present general fear of war in many people and countries?

A. I am convinced that neither the nations nor their armies want a new war, - they want

peace and are trying to maintain it. Thus, "the present fear of war" is not caused from this side. I am of the opinion that "the present fear of war" is caused by the actions of some political groups that engage in propaganda for a new war and in this way sow the seeds of distrust and insecurity.

Q. What must the governments of the freedom-loving countries do to secure peace and calm in the whole world?

A. It is necessary for the public and the government circles of the states to organize counter-propaganda on a broad basis against the propagandists of a new war, for the securing of peace, so that the campaign of the propagandists of a new war meets adequate resistance from the public and the press, - so that the arsonists of war are unmasked in time and denied the possibility of using freedom of speech against the interests of peace.

("Daily Review," No. 70, 24 March, 1946)

REPLY TO A TELEGRAM FROM MR. HUGH BAILLIE

25 March, 1946

Telegram from Mr. Hugh Baillie, President of the United Press Agency, to Generalissimo Stalin, Kremlin, Moscow:

I would like to draw your attention to the declaration made by Winston Churchill to the United Press, which was transmitted by press

and radio all over the world.

On this occasion I would like to renew my proposition on behalf of United Press, that you make a declaration on the international situation. If you want to reply to Churchill's argument on the necessity of rapid action of the Security Council of the United Nations Organization on the Iranian question, United Press would be pleased to transmit your views to the whole world. In the case of you wishing to put other questions concerning Iran or international peace and security, I beg you to utilize our possibilities which we place at your disposal with great pleasure.

Reply to Mr. Hugh Baillie of United Press, New York:

Thank you for your friendly offer. I do not find Mr. Churchill's argument convincing. On the question of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Iran, that will be decided in a positive way by an agreement between the Soviet government and the government of Iran.

J. STALIN

President of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R.

("Pravda," 27 March, 1946)

REPLY TO A MESSAGE FROM THE PRIME MINISTER OF IRAN

April 1946

I thank Your Excellence for the friendly sentiments expressed in your telegram on the occasion of the successful conclusion of the Soviet-Iranian Treaty, in which you have played an active part personally. I am persuaded that the agreement realized between the U.S.S.R. and Iran in the form of this treaty will serve to develop and deeply strengthen the cooperation and friendship between the peoples of our countries.

GENERALISSIMO STALIN
President of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R.

("Pravda," 8 April, 1946)

ORDER OF THE DAY OF THE MINISTER OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE U.S.S.R. NO. 7

Moscow. 1 May, 1946

Comrades of the Red Army and Red Navy, Sergeants and Mates!

Comrades Officers, Generals and Admirals!

Working people of the Soviet Union!

For the first time since the victory in the Great Patriotic War we celebrate the First of May, the international holiday of the working people, under peaceful conditions, which we have reached after hard struggle against the en-

emy and at the price of great sacrifices and sufferings.

A year ago the Red Army raised the banner of victory over Berlin and finished off the smashing of fascist Germany. Four months after the victory over Germany, imperialist Japan capitulated. The Second World War, prepared by the forces of international reaction and started by the main fascist states, ended in complete victory for the freedom-loving peoples.

The smashing and liquidation of the centres of fascism and world aggression led to a profound change in the political life of the peoples of the world and to a profound growth of the democratic movement of the people. Ripened by the experiences of war, the masses learned that they should not leave the fate of their states in the hands of reactionary leaders who follow limited, self-seeking class interests against the people. Thus, the people who want to change their lives take the fate of their state into their own hands and erect a democratic order and lead an active struggle against the reactionary powers, against the arsonists of a new war.

The peoples of the whole world do not want another war. They struggle desperately for the ensuring of peace and security.

In the vanguard of the struggle for peace and security marches the Soviet Union, which has played a leading role in the smashing of fascism and has fulfilled her high mission of liberation.

The peoples who were liberated by the Soviet Union from the fascist yoke were given the possibility of founding their states on democratic principles and to realize their historical hopes. On this path they receive the fraternal help of the Soviet Union.

The whole world was able to convince itself not only of the power of the Soviet state, but also of the just character of its politics, based on the recognition of the equality of all peoples, based on respect for their freedom and self-determination. There is no reason to doubt that the Soviet Union will, in the future, continue these politics which are the politics of peace and security, equality and friendship of the peoples.

Since the ending of the war, the Soviet Union is progressing in peaceful socialist construction. With great enthusiasm the Soviet people are continuing the peaceful constructive work that was interrupted by the war.

The Five Year Plan for the reconstruction and development of the people's economy of the U.S.S.R., for the years 1946 - 1950, that has been approved by the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union, opens new perspectives for the further growth of the productive forces of our Motherland, the strengthening of its economic power, the raising of its material wealth and its culture.

The Five Year Plan was accepted by the workers, peasants and intelligentsia of our country as a programme entirely meeting their interests. It can be expected that the Soviet people, led by the Communist Party, will spare no effort not only to fulfil this Five Year Plan, but also to over-fulfil it by their enedeavours.

While we develop this peaceful socialist construction we must not at any moment forget the machinations of international reaction, its plans for a new war. One must not forget the guidelines of the great Lenin that during the transition to peaceful work one must constantly be alert, and constantly keep an eye on the strength of the armed forces and their ability to defend our country.

The armed forces of the Soviet Union, our army, our airforce and our navy have fulfilled their duty towards our Motherland in the Great Patriotic War. The new task for our armed forces is to be on guard, to protect the peace and the constructive work of the Soviet people, and to safeguard the interests of the Soviet Union.

The successful fulfillment of this honourable task is possible only under the conditions of further development of the military culture and art of war of the fighters and commanders of our army, our navy and our airforce.

The armed forces of the Soviet Union have to raise their standards in the art of war, based on the experiences of war, based on the development of the science and technique of war.

There is no doubt that our army, our fleet and our airforce will honourably fulfil their task.

Comrades of the Red Army and Red Navy,

Sergeants and Mates! Comrade Officers, Mates and Generals!

Comrades working men and women, men and women peasants, intellectuals!

Demobilized fighters of the Red Army!

In the name of the government and the Communist Party, I greet you and congratulate you on the occasion of the First of May, on the occasion of the international holiday of the working people, and I order:

Today, 1 May, in the capital of our Motherland, Moscow, in the capitals of the Union Republics as well as in Lvov, Königsberg, Chabarovsk, Vladivostok, Port-Arthur and in the heroic cities of Leningrad, Stalingrad, Sevastopol and Odessa, a salute of 20 artillery salvoes.

Long live our brave armed forces!

Long live our glorious Communist Party!

Long live the great Soviet people!

Long live our powerful Soviet Motherland!

J. STALIN

Minister of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R.

Generalissimo of the Soviet Union.

("Pravda," 1 May, 1946)

ORDER OF THE DAY OF THE MINISTER OF ARMED FORCES OF THE U.S.S.R. NO. 11

9 May, 1946

Comrades soldiers and sailors of the Red Army and Red Navy! Comrades officers, generals and admirals! Workers of the Soviet Union!

Today we celebrate the first anniversary of the great victory won by our people over fascist Germany, which attacked the liberty and independence of our Motherland.

In the name of the Soviet government and of our Communist Party, I salute and congratulate you on the occasion of the national celebration, the day of victory over the German fascists.

To celebrate the victory feast, I order: today, 9 May, a salute of thirty artillery salvoes in the capital of our Motherland, Moscow and in the capitals of the federal republics, Lvov, Königsberg, and in the heroic cities of Leningrad, Stalingrad, Sebastopol and Odessa.

Glory to our armed forces who kept the honour and independence of our Motherland and who won victory over Hitler Germany!

Glory to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, inspirer and organizer of our victory!

Glory to our great people, the victorious people!

Eternal glory to the heroes who fell in the fight for the freedom and independence of our Motherland!

J. STALIN

("Pravda," 9 May, 1946)

ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS OF THE MOSCOW CORRESPONDENT OF THE "SUNDAY TIMES", MR. ALEXANDER WERTH, IN A LETTER OF 17 SEPTEMBER, 1946

24 September, 1946

Q. Do you think there is a real danger of "new war," which is being so irresponsibly talked about in the whole world at the moment? What steps should be taken to prevent this war, if such a danger exists?

A. I do not believe in the actual danger of a new war. The clamour about a new war now comes mainly from military-political secret agents and the people behind them in the administration. They need this alarm, if only for the purpose of spreading it in the areas of their opposition.

a) Certain naive politicians try to get as many concessions as possible out of the opposition and help their own government by frightening people with the spectre of war;

b) to hinder the reduction of military budgets in their countries for a certain time;

c) to block the demobilization of their troops and thereby guard against a swift rise in unemployment numbers in their countries.

One must differentiate between the present clamour and outcry about a "new war," and the real danger of a "new war," which does not exist at the present time.

Q. Do you think that Great Britain and the United States of America are deliberately carrying out a "capitalist encirclement" of the Soviet Union?

A. I am not of the opinion that Great Britain and the United States of America could carry out a "capitalist encirclement" of the Soviet Union even if they wanted to, which, in any case, I do not maintain.

Q. To quote Mr. Wallace in his last speech, can England, Western Europe and the United States be sure that Soviet politics in Germany will not be turned into a Russian instrument against Western Europe?

A. I believe that the possibility of Germany making profitable moves through the Soviet Union, against Western Europe and the United States can be excluded. I think that it can be excluded also, not only because the Soviet Union, Great Britain and France are bound by their joint and mutual support against German aggression and through the decisions of the Potsdam Conference which bind these three powers to the United States, but also because Germany's political exploitation against Western Europe and the United States of America would mean a deviation on the part of the Soviet Union from their fundamental national interests. To put it in a nutshell, the politics of the Soviet Union in relation to the German problem is restricted by itself to the demilitarization and democratization of Germany. I believe that the demilitarization and democratization of Ger-

many to be the most meaningful guarantee for the building of a stable and lasting peace.

Q. What is your opinion about the accusation that the politics of the Communist parties in Western Europe "are directed by Moscow"?

A. I regard this accusation as an absurdity that people have borrowed from the bankrupt arsenal of Hitler and Goebbels.

Q. Do you believe in the possibility of a friendly and lasting cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Western democracies, despite the existing ideological differences, and in "friendly competition" between the two systems, as Wallace mentioned in his speech?

A. I firmly believe in that.

Q. During the stay of the deputation from the Labour Party in the Soviet Union, you have, as far as I have been informed, expressed certainty regarding the friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Great Britain. What would help to establish these relations which the majority of the English people obviously desire?

A. I am really certain of the possibility of friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Great Britain. The strengthening of the political, economic and cultural ties between these countries would contribute enormously to the construction of such relations.

Q. Do you believe that the earliest possible withdrawal of all American troops from China would be of the greatest significance for future peace?

A. Yes, I believe so.

Q. Do you believe that the actual monopoly of the United States on the atom bomb to be one of the greatest threats to peace?

A. I do not think that the atom bomb is such a power as certain politicians are disposed to state. The atom bomb is intended to frighten people with weak nerves, but it cannot decide the fate of a war, and would under no circumstances suffice for this purpose. Certainly, the monopoly on the secrets of the atom bomb poses a threat, but against that there are at least two things:

a) The monopoly on the possession of the atom bomb cannot last long;

b) the use of the atom bomb will be forbidden.

Q. Do you believe that with the further progress of Communism in the Soviet Union, the possibility of friendly cooperation with the outside world, as far as the Soviet Union is concerned, will not be reduced? Is "Communism in one country" possible?

A. I have no doubt that the possibility of peaceful cooperation will not be reduced, far from it, but could even be made stronger. "Communism in one country" is absolutely possible, especially in a country like the Soviet Union.

("Pravda," 25 September, 1946)

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS OF 23 OCTOBER, 1946, FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN NEWS AGENCY UNITED PRESS, HUGH BAILLIE

29 October, 1946

Q. Do you agree with the opinion of Secretary of State Byrnes over the growing tension between the U.S.S.R. and the United States, which he expressed in his radio broadcast last Friday?

A. No.

Q. Could you perhaps, in case of growing tension, give a cause or causes for such a thing and what would be the main remedy against this?

A. This question has already been dealt with in my previous answer.

Q. Do you believe that the imminent negotiations will lead to the conclusion of peace contracts, bring about the warmest relations among peoples formerly bound together in the war against fascism and remove the danger of the chains of war on the part of former Axis countries?

A. I hope so.

Q. What are otherwise the main obstacles to the construction of such warm mutual relations between peoples who were bound together in the Great War?

A. The question has been dealt with in my previous answer.

Q. How does Russia view the decision of Yugoslavia not to sign the peace treaty with Italy?

A. Yugoslavia has reason to be discontent.

Q. What is your opinion concerning the serious threat to the peace of the whole world?

A. The instigators of a new war, above all Churchill and his sympathizers in England and the U.S.A.

Q. What steps should be taken by the peoples of the world to prevent a new war, in case such a threat should present itself?

A. They must unmask and restrain the instigators of a new war.

Q. Is the United Nations Organization a guarantee for the inviolability of small countries?

A. That is, at present, difficult to say.

Q. Do you believe that the four occupied zones in Germany must be united as regards economic administration in the near future, to bring Germany back to economic unity and to lighten the burden of the four powers of occupation?

A. One must bring back not only the economic but also the political unity of Germany.

Q. Do you consider it possible to establish a certain central administration which should be put in the hands of the Germans themselves, although under Allied control, and whereby the Council of Foreign Ministers would be made possible, to work out the peace treaty for Germany?

A. Yes, I consider that to be possible.

Q. Are you authorized to judge, after the successful voting in the different zones this summer and autumn, the sureness that Germany is developing in a political and democratic way that will lead to hopes of her future being the future of a peaceful nation?

A. On this, I am not at present, certain.

Q. Do you believe that, as it was suggested in some circles, Germany's permitted industry level should be raised above the agreed level, so that Germany will be fully self-sufficient?

A. Yes, I believe that.

Q. What must be done, apart from the existing programme of the four occupation powers, to prevent Germany again becoming a military threat to peace?

A. One must actually root out the left overs of fascism and thoroughly democratize Germany.

Q. Should one allow the German people to reconstruct their industry and trade in order to be self-sufficient?

A. Yes, one should.

Q. In your opinion, have the resolutions of the Potsdam Conference been fulfilled? If not, what is then necessary to make the Potsdam declaration an effective instrument?

A. They are not all fulfilled, especially in the area of the democratization of Germany.

Q. Do you believe that during the negotiations between the four Foreign Ministers on the occasion of the assembly of the Council of

the United Nations, the right of veto was misused?

A. No, I do not believe that.

Q. In the view of the Kremlin, how far should the Allied powers go in the search for and prosecution of second-rate German war criminals? Is one of the opinion that the Nuremberg decisions are a firmly adequate basis for such steps?

A. The further one goes, so much the better.

Q. Does Russia believe the western borders of Poland to be stable?

A. Yes.

Q. How does the U.S.S.R. judge the presence of British troops in Greece? Do you believe that England should supply the present Greek government with more weapons?

A. It is unnecessary.

Q. How great are the Russian troop contingents in Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Austria, and for what duration, in your opinion, will these contingents be retained in the interest of safeguarding peace?

A. In the West, that is, in Germany, Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania and Poland, the Soviet Union has at the moment 60 divisions altogether, (artillery and tank divisions together), most of them not in full amount. In Yugoslavia you will find no Soviet troops. In two months, when the order of the Praesidium of the Supreme Soviet of 22 October this year on the last demobilization is accomplished, 40 So-

viet divisions will stay in the above mentioned countries.

Q. How does the government of the U.S.-S.R. feel about the presence of American war ships in the Mediterranean?

A. Indifferent.

Q. How are the times on the prospect regarding a trade treaty between Russian and Norway?

A. That is difficult to say at the moment.

Q. Is it possible for Finland to become once again a self-sufficient nation, after the reparations have been paid, and is there any intention regarding a revision of the reparation programme so that the re-birth of Finland could be accelerated?

A. The question is not well put. Finland was and remains an abundantly self-sufficient nation.

Q. What would be the importance of a trade treaty with Sweden and other countries in the matter of the reconstruction of the U.S.-S.R? What help do you desire from abroad for the completion of this great task?

A. The treaty with Sweden is a contribution to the economic cooperation of nations.

Q. Is Russia still interested in receiving a loan from the United States?

A. Yes, it is interested in that.

Q. Does Russia already have the atom bomb or any similar weapon?

A. No.

Q. What is your opinion of the atom bomb or a similar weapon as an instrument of war?

A. I have already given my opinion of the atom bomb in the well known answers to Mr. Werth.

Q. In your opinion, how can atomic energy be best controlled? Should this control be founded on an international basis, and in what measure should the power of your sovereignty be sacrificed in the interests of the establishment of an effective control?

A. Strict international control is necessary.

Q. How much time is needed for the reconstruction of the devastasted area of western Russia?

A. Six or seven years, if not more.

Q. Would Russia permit the activity of civil air lines over the area of the Soviet Union? Does Russia have the intention to expand her air line to other continents on the basis of mutual interests?

A. Under certain conditions, that is not excluded.

Q. How does your government judge the occupation of Japan? Do you hold this to be a success?

A. It is successful, but it could be better.

("Pravda," 30 October, 1946)

TELEGRAM TO THE SLAVIC CONGRESS REUNION IN BELGRADE

8 December, 1946

I greet the participants of the first Slavic Congress since the war, the representatives of the peace-loving Slavic peoples. I am sure that the Slavic Congress will contribute to and deeply strengthen the friendship and fraternal solidarity of the Slavic peoples and will serve the cause of the development of democracy and the consolidation of peace between the peoples.

J. STALIN

("Slaviane," 1, 1947, Moscow)

INTERVIEW WITH ELLIOT ROOSEVELT

21 December, 1946

Q. Do you believe that it is possible in this world for a democracy such as the United States to live peacefully side by side with a Communist model of state administration, such as there is in the Soviet Union, without one or the other side attempting to interfere in the internal politics of the other side?

A. Yes, of course. That is not only possible, it is sensible and thoroughly realizable. During the time of the war, the differences between our two forms of government did not hinder us from uniting and defeating our enemy. In

peace, it is possible to an even greater extent, to maintain these relations.

Q. Do you believe that the success of the United Nations depends on agreement between the Soviet Union, England and the United States on basic questions of politics and their aims?

A. Yes, I believe so. In many respects the fate of the United Nations Organization as an organization, depends on the bringing about of harmony between these three powers.

Q. Do you believe, Generalissimo, that the bringing about of an economic treaty on a large scale on the mutual exchange of industrial production and raw materials between our two countries, would be an important step towards general peace?

A. Yes, I accept that it would be an important step towards the construction of general peace. Of course I agree to that. A furthering of international trade would, in many respects, encourage the development of good relations between our two countries.

Q. Is the Soviet Union in favour of the Security Council of the United Nations immediately creating an international police force with the participation of all the military forces of the United Nations, so that everywhere that peace is threatened by the prospect of war, it can immediately intervene?

A. Of course.

Q. If you are of the opinion that the United Nations should control the atom bomb, must that not be done through inspection and

the establishment of control over all research institutes and industrial plants that produce any manner of weapons, as well as over the peaceful application and development of atomic energy?

(At this point, Elliot Roosevelt adds: Stalin immediately asked: "In general?" I said: "Yes, but especially, is the Soviet Union in agreement in principal with such a plan?")

A. Of course. On the basis of the principal of equality it is not for the Soviet Union to make exceptions. It must submit to the same rules of inspection and control, like all the other countries.

(At this point Roosevelt remarks: This answer followed without hesitation and the question of the reservation of the right of veto was not even mentioned.)

Q. Do you believe that the convocation of a new assembly of the big three for the discussion of all international problems, the present threat to general peace, would be useful?

A. I am of the opinion that not one assembly, but rather several, must take place. If several assemblies take place, very useful objectives would be served.

(Here Roosevelt remarks: At this moment my wife asked whether he thought that such meetings would help establish closer contacts on lower government levels too. She also asked whether such cooperation had been achieved through the conferences during the war.

Stalin turned to her and answered with a

smile: "There is no doubt about that. The consultations of the war times and the successes achieved have greatly helped by the bringing about of a closer cooperation on lower government levels.")

Q. I know that you study many political and social problems that exist in other countries. May I then ask whether you are of the opinion that the election that was held in the United States in November, lets us infer that the people are moving away from their belief in Roosevelt's politics in favour of the isolationist politics of his political opponents?

A. I am not so well acquainted with the internal life of the people of the United States, but it appears to me that the elections let us infer that the present government has squandered the moral and political capital that the late President achieved, and have in this way helped the Republican victory.

(At this point Roosevelt adds: The Generalissimo answered my next question with great emphasis.)

Q. What do you think has caused the loosening of the friendly relations and mutual agreements between our two countries since the death of Roosevelt?

A. I am of the opinion that, if this question concerns the relations and mutual agreement between the American and Russian p e o p l e, they have not deteriorated at all, but on the contrary, they have improved. Concerning the relations of the two governments, there have been

misunderstandings. There was a certain deterioration, then a big clamour arose that the relations would deteriorate further in the future. But I see nothing frightening in this, in the sense of damaging peace or in the sense of a military conflict. No one big power is presently able to, even if the government itself is striving to, raise a big army to fight against another Allied power, to set up another great power, because at the present nobody can make war without the people, but the people do not want to led into another war. The people are tired of war, besides there is no obvious aim to justify a new war. Nobody would know what they were fighting for, and so I see nothing to be frightened of, in that some representatives of the government of the United States speak of the deterioration in our relations. In regard of all these considerations, I do not believe in the danger of a new war.

Q. Are you for a large scale cultural and economic exchange between our two countries? Are you for an exchange of students, artists, economists and professors?

A. Of course I am.

Q. Should the United States and the Soviet Union jointly work out, for a calculated long period of time, a policy of assistance to the peoples of the Far East?

A. I am of the opinion that this would be useful, if it was possible. In any case, our government is prepared to carry out a joint policy with the United States, in the Far East.

Q. If a treaty was made between the United States and the Soviet Union on a system of loans and credits, would such a treaty bring continuous advantage to the people's economy of the United States?

A. Such a credit system would undoubtedly be of advantage as much for the United States as for the Soviet Union.

(Here Roosevelt remarks: After that, I put a question that in many European countries evident anxiety has been aroused.)

Q. Does the fact that, in the American and English zones in Germany, the de-nazification programme is not being carried through, cause the Soviet government serious concern?

A. No, that is not a cause of serious concern, but of course the Soviet Union is not in agreement that this part of our joint programme is not being carried through.

("Bolshevik," No. 1, 1947)

ANSWERING MESSAGE TO THE BRITISH FOREIGN MINISTER, BEVIN

On the English-Soviet Treaty

22 January, 1947

I received your letter of 18 January, and must admit that your decl[illegible]ion that Great Britain is bound to nobody [illegible]pt the oblig-

ations resulting from the Charter, has amazed me. It seems to me that such a declaration without a corresponding explanation, could be misused by the enemies of an English-Soviet friendship. It is clear to me that regardless of the reservations in the English-Soviet treaty and regardless of how these reservations weaken the importance of the post war treaty, the existence of the English-Soviet treaty puts obligations on our countries.

I had exactly these circumstances in mind when I explained, in my interview of 17 September, 1946 with Alexander Werth, (a British correspondent in Moscow), that "the Soviet Union has obligations through a mutual support treaty with Great Britain against German aggression," and consequently has obligations towards Great Britain, besides the obligations that result from the Charter.

Your message, however, and the declaration of the British government clarifies the matter and leaves no room for misunderstanding. It is clear by now that you and I share the same opinions on the English-Soviet treaty.

Concerning the prolonging of the English-Soviet Treaty, which is especially mentioned in the declaration of the British government, I have to declare that it is necessary to change the treaty before prolonging it, by freeing it from its weaker reservations, if you want to talk of such an extension. Only after this has

been done, can one seriously discuss the prolonging of the treaty.

J. STALIN

("New World," No. 3, February 1947. Pp. 7 - 8)

ORDER OF THE DAY ON THE OCCASION OF THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE SOVIET ARMY NO. 10

23 February, 1947

Comrades soldiers, sailors, officers, generals and admirals! Today our country is celebrating the twenty-ninth anniversary of the Soviet Army.

The Soviet Army, founded by the great Lenin, has trodden a glorious path. Its entire history is a living example of heroism, undeviating attachment to the Motherland and valorous achievements in the military field, which found expression particularly in the magnificent victories won by the Soviet Army in the Great Patriotic War.

The Motherland will never forget the high heroic deeds of its army.

The Soviet Army celebrates its twenty-ninth anniversary at the moment when our people are untiringly accomplishing the tasks set by the devastation of the war, in the re-establishment and development of the national economy.

The workers, peasants and intellectuals of our country, who have successfully fulfilled the

quotas of the first year of the new Five Year Plan, struggle heroically for the rapid acceleration of economic activity, for the supplementation of production of consumer goods, for the rapid progress of Soviet science and technology.

The elections to the Supreme Soviets of the Federal Republics, which were held, have resulted in the complete victory of the bloc of Communists and their Party. It shows that the unity of Soviet society is indestructible, that all the Soviet citizens are firmly grouped behind their government and the Communist Party, and are firmly assuring the development of their Motherland.

In times of peace, the Soviet Army must accomplish the task of military preparation which they have been set, march in advance and win new and more important successes in military preparation and political education. The work of consolidating peace and the security of our country is required.

The essential principle of the military preparation of the Soviet armed forces has always consisted, and still consists today, of educating the troops in war conditions. The experience of the last war has proved the high morale and combat quality of the troops, a good military and political preparation, a great mastery of the techniques of combat, coordination and great physical endurance.

The task that now faces our army, navy and airforce is to untiringly perfect, day by day, their military formation, to profitably pursue profound study based on their experience of war.

The generals, admirals and officers must continue to broaden their knowledge of military theory and politics and equally learn the methods of military preparation, which are necessary for training in peace time.

The non-commissioned officers must energetically apply the process of command to become the prime aides of officers in the observance of military discipline and in the instruction and education of soldiers and sailors.

The soldiers and sailors must, with all their might, perefct in detail their preparation from the point of view of mastery of weapons, of special military tactics and political formations; they must acquire the necessary physical strength to take part in combat and be able to surmount all difficulties of battles and combat.

In the instruction and education of their subordinates, all the commanders and chiefs must take it upon themselves to care for their conditions of life, their physical well-being and their equipment, in accordance with the regulations.

Strong military discipline is primarily based on the high conscience and political education of the military and is the preliminary condition of most importance for the combat strength of our armed forces. Also, all the commanders and chiefs must untiringly affirm military discipline and, very necessary, encourage the spirit of patriotism unceasingly in their subordinates, the

sense of personal responsibility of every soldier for the defence of the Motherland.

Comrades soldiers, sailors and non-commissioned officers!

Comrades officers, generals and admirals!

I salute and congratulate you on the occasion of the twenty-ninth anniversary of our Soviet Army, in the name of the Soviet government and of our Communist Party.

In honour of the twenty-ninth anniversary of the Soviet Army, I order: today, 23 February, a salute of twenty artillery salvoes in the capital of our Motherland, Moscow, in the capitals of the federative republics, in Koliningrad, Lvov, Khabarovsk, Vladivostok, Port Arthur and in the heroic cities of Leningrad, Stalingrad, Sebastopol and Odessa.

Long live the Soviet Army and the military sailors!

Long live our Soviet government!

Long live our great Communist Party!

Long live our great Soviet people!

("Pravda," 23 February, 1947)

INTERVIEW WITH THE AMERICAN REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE, HAROLD STASSEN

Protocol of the interview

9 April, 1947

Stassen declared that he was grateful to Stalin for receiving him. He, Stassen, had wanted an interview with Stalin as the State leader, to show his respect. He, Stassen, had undergone an interesting journey through the European countries, and during this journey was particularly interested in the economic situation of different countries after the war. It was his opinion that the living standards of the people was of great significance for their prosperity. The relations between the Soviet Union and the United States were of great significance during the war and would also be of further great significance. He was aware that that the economic systems of the U.S.S.R. and the United States of America were different. The economy of the U.S.S.R. was on the principle of planning, was built on Socialist principles and its development led by the Communist Party. In the United States there was a free economy with private capital. It would interest him to know if Stalin was of the opinion that these two economic systems could live side by side in one and the same world, and if they could cooperate together after the war.

Stalin answered that of course the two systems could cooperate together. The difference between them was of no great essential significance as far as their cooperation was concerned. The economic systems in Germany and the United States of America were the same, nevertheless it had come to war between them. The economic systems of the United States of America and the U.S.S.R. were different, but it had not led them to war with one another, but rather led them to cooperate during the war. If two different systems could cooperate during the war, why should they not be able to cooperate in peace time? Of course, he meant by that, that cooperation between two different economic systems was possible if the wish to cooperate existed. But if the wish to cooperate did not exist, then the states and people even of similar economic systems could come into conflict.

Stassen declared that the wish to cooperate was, of course, of great importance. However, earlier, before the war, in both countries, different declarations of the impossibility of cooperation had been made. Before the war, Stalin too, had himself declared this. He, Stassen, would like to know whether Stalin was of the opinion that the events of the war, the defeat of the fascist Axis of Germany and Japan, had changed the situation, and one could now, if the wish existed, hope for cooperation between the U.S.S.R. and the United States of America.

Stalin answered that he could in no case

have said that the two different systems could not cooperate. Lenin was the first to express the idea on the cooperation of two systems. "Lenin is our teacher," said Stalin, "and we Soviet people are Lenin's pupils. We have never deviated from Lenin's directives and we never will deviate." It was possible that he, Stalin, had said that a system, for example the capitalist system, was not willing to cooperate, but this remark concerned the wish to cooperate, but not the possibility of cooperation. But where the possibility of cooperation was concerned, he, Stalin, stood on Lenin's standpoint that cooperation between two economic systems was possible and desirable. It was also the wish of the people and the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. concerning cooperation; they had this wish. Such a cooperation could only be useful for both countries.

Stassen answered that that was clear. It reminded him of the explanation Stalin had given to the 18th Party Congress and the Plenary Session in 1937. In this declaration he had spoken of "the capitalist environment," and of "monopoly and imperialist development." From the explanation that Stalin had made today, he, Stassen, had inferred that now, after the defeat of Japan and Germany, the situation had changed.

Stalin declared that at no Party Congress and at no Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party had he spoken, nor could he have, of the impossibility of the

cooperation of two systems. He, Stalin, had said that in a capitalist environment there existed the danger of an attack on the U.S.S.R.. If one of the parts did not want to cooperate, that signified that the danger of an attack existed. And, in fact, Germany did not want to cooperate with the U.S.S.R., and had attcked the U.S.S.R. Had the U.S.S.R. been able to cooperate with Germany? Yes, the U.S.S.R. had been able to cooperate with Germany, but the Germans had not wanted this. Otherwise the U.S.S.R. would have cooperated with Germany as they had with other countries. " As you see, the wish for cooperation existed, but not the possibility.

One must distinguish between the possibility of cooperation and the wish to cooperate. The possibility of cooperation is always there, but the wish to cooperate is not always there. If one part does not want to cooperate, it results in conflict, in war."

Stassen declared that the wish must be present on both sides. Stalin replied that he wanted to attest to the fact that Russia had the wish to cooperate.

Stassen said that he was pleased to hear that, and that he would like to go into Stalin's declaration about the similarity of the economic systems of the United States of America and Germany. He must say that the economic systems of the United States of America and Germany had been different from one another when it was Germany that began the war.

Stalin was not in agreement with that and explained that there was a difference between the regimes of the United States of America and Germany, but no difference between the economic systems. The regime is transient, a political factor.

Stassen said that many articles had been written saying that the capitalist system had produced the menace of monopolies, imperialism and the oppression of the workers. In his, Stassen's, opinion, the United States of America had succeeded in preventing the development of the monopolist and imperialist tendencies of capitalism, had led to prosperity and through this the workers in the United States of America had a larger say in many matters than Marx and Engels had thought possible. Therein lay the difference between the economic system of the United States of America and the economic system that existed in Hitler's Germany.

Stalin said that one must not allow oneself to be carried away by the criticism of the system of the other. Every people holds firmly to the system that it wants. History will show which system is better. One must respect the system that the people choose and approve. Whether the system in the United States of America is bad or good is a matter for the American people. For cooperation, it is not necessary for the peoples to have the same system. One must respect the system approved by the people. Only on these terms is cooperation possible.

Concerning Marx and Engels, they of course, could not predict what would happen forty years after their deaths.

The Soviet system was called a totalitarian or a dictatorship system, but the Soviet people call the American system monopoly capitalism. If the two sides begin to insult each other as monopolist or totalitarian they would not come to cooperation. One must take note of the historical fact that there exist two systems which have been approved by the people. Only on this basis is cooperation possible.

Where the passion for the criticism of monopolism and totalitarianism was concerned, it was propaganda, - but he, Stalin, was not a propagandist, - rather a man of deeds. We may not be sectarian, Stalin said. If the people wish to change a system, they will do so. As he, Stalin, had met Roosevelt and discussed military questions, he and Roosevelt had not insulted each other as monopolists and totalitarianists. They had considered it more essential that he and Roosevelt had established cooperation with one another and had achieved victory over the enemy.

Stassen said that this manner of criticism of both sides had been one of the causes of the misunderstandings that had arisen since the end of the war. He, Stassen, wished to know whether Stalin hoped in the future to raise to a higher degree the exchange of ideas, students, teachers, actors and tourists, if cooperation was established between the U.S.S.R. and the United

States of America.

Stalin answered that it was inevitable, if cooperation was established. The exchange of goods led to the exchange of people.

Stassen said that in the past there had been misunderstandings between the U.S.S.R. and the United States of America, that the Soviet side did not wish to exchange ideas, as was seen in the introduction of censorship of reports sent out by foreign reporters from Moscow. So that in the circumstances, that the newspaper "New York Herald Tribune" was refused permission to have a reporter of their own in Moscow, that this mistake was one of the causes of the mutual misunderstandings between the peoples of the U.S.S.R. and the United States of America.

Stalin answered that the case of the refusal of a visa for a correspondent of the "New York Herald Tribune" had, as a matter of fact, happened. That this misunderstanding, however, was an accidental phenomenon and had no relation to the politics of the Soviet government. He, Stalin, knew that the "New York Herald Tribune" was a respectable newspaper. In this respect, it was of great significance that some American correspondents were unfavourably disposed towards the U.S.S.R.

Stassen answered that it was a fact that there were such reporters. The reporter of the "New York Herald Tribune" was given permission to stay in Moscow, however, only for the duration of the session of the Council of Foreign

Ministers. Now this newspaper posed the question of sending a permanent reporter to Moscow. The "New York Herald Tribune" was a leading organ of the Republicans, that was gaining more importance now that the Republicans had gained a majority in Congress.

Stalin answered: "That is of no importance to us, we see no great difference between the Republicans and the Democrats." Concerning the question of the reporters, he, Stalin, remembered an incident. In Tehran, the three great powers held a conference in which they worked efficiently and in a friendly atmosphere. An American reporter whose name he could not remember at the moment, had sent a report that Marshal Timoshenko was present at the Tehran Conference, although in reality he was not there, and that he, Stalin, had violently attacked Timoshenko during the dinner. But that was a big and slanderous lie. And now? Should one praise such a reporter? At that dinner, where the participants celebrated Churchill's sixty-ninth birthday, he Churchill, Brook, Leahy and others were present, in total about thirty people could attest that no such thing had taken place. Nevertheless this reporter had sent his false report to the newspaper, and it was published in the press of the United States of America. "Can one trust such a reporter? We," said Stalin, "are not of the opinion that the United States of America or its politicians are to blame for this. Such incidents do happen. That caused bad feelings among the Soviet people."

Stassen said that cases of irresponsible reporters sending false reports did happen, but other reporters corrected the mistake of the first, and after a while the people knew which reporters they could trust and which they could not.

Stalin answered that this was correct.

Stassen said that any time a reporter gave an intentional and obviously false report, his paper would recall him, and thus our newspapers would create a team of honest and capable reporters.

Stalin said that these reporters write only sensational news which newspapers will publish to earn money and then dismiss these reporters afterwards.

Stassen said that in the spheres of the press, trade and culture, the two systems must finds ways and means to build up good relations with one another.

Stalin said that he was right.

Stassen declared that he believed that if the reports of reporters did not undergo censorship, this would be a better basis for cooperation and mutual understanding between our people and each other.

Stalin said in the U.S.S.R. it would be difficult to do away with censorship. Molotov had tried more than once, but had been unable to do away with it. Each time the Soviet government had tried to do without censorship they had regretted it and had re-introduced it. In the autumn of the previous year they had done

away with censorship. He, Stalin, had been on holiday and the reporters had begun to write that Molotov had forced Stalin to go on holiday, and then they wrote that Stalin, on returning, would drive out Molotov. Thereby these reporters had presented the Soviet government to some extent as a wild animal house. Of course, the Soviet people were indignant about this and thus, censorship had to be re-introduced.

Stassen said that he now understood that Stalin held cooperation to be possible if the wish and the intention to cooperate existed.

Stalin answered that he was completely ht.

Stassen said that for the raising of living standards the mechanization and electrification was of great importance, and the application of atomic energy in industry was of great importance for all the peoples as well as for the peoples of the U.S.S.R. and the United States of America. He, Stassen, was of the opinion that the creating of an inspection and control system and that the use of atomic energy for military purposes should be declared illegal, was of great importance for all the peoples of the world. Was Stalin of the opinion that in the future, they should come to terms over the control and regulation of the production of atomic energy and over its peaceful application?

Stalin answered that he hoped so. Between the U.S.S.R. and the United States of America there stood great differences of opinion on this question, but finally both sides, - so he, Stalin,

hoped, - would come to terms. In his, Stalin's, view there would need to be international control and inspection and this would be of great importance. The application of atomic energy for peaceful purposes would cause a great revolution in production procedure. Where the application of atomic energy for military purposes was concerned, it possibly would be forbidden. The desires and the conscience of the peoples demanded so.

Stassen answered that it was one of the most important problems. If it was solved, atomic energy could be a great blessing for the peoples of all the world, but if not, then a great curse.

Stalin said that he believed it would be possible to establish international control and inspection. The development moved towards that.

Stassen thanked Stalin for the interview.

Stalin answered that he was at Stassen's disposal and that the Russians respected their guests.

Stassen said that during the San Francisco Conference he had had an unofficial talk with Molotov. In the course of this conversation he had been invited to visit Russia.

Stalin said that he believed the situation in Europe was very bad now. What did Mr. Stassen think about it?

Stassen answered that this was right in general, - that some countries had not suffered so much from the war and were not in such a difficult position, for example Czechoslovakia

and Switzerland.

Stalin said that Switzerland and Czechoslovakia were small countries.

Stassen answered that the large countries found themselves in a very difficult situation. The problems they were facing were of a financial, raw materials and nutritional nature.

Stalin explained that Europe was a part of the world in which there were many factories and works, but where there was a perceptible lack of raw materials and food. That was tragic.

Stassen thought that the poor level of the output of the coal production in the Ruhr area had led to a coal shortage in Europe.

Stalin said that a coal shortage had also been felt in England and that this was most strange.

Stassen explained that the coal production in the United States of America fortunately stood at a high level. In the United States of America, two million tons of bituminate coal was mined daily. Consequently, the United States of America was in the position of being able to supply Europe with large amounts of coal.

Stalin declared that the situation was not so bad in the United States of America. America was protected by two oceans. On the northern border of the United States of America was the weak country of Canada, and in the south the weak country of Mexico. The United States of America did not need to be afraid of them. After the War of Independence the people had

not been involved in war for sixty years and had enjoyed peace. All that had contributed to the swift development of the United States of America. In addition, the population of the United States of America consisted of people that had liberated themselves long ago from the yoke of kings and land aristocracy. All these circumstances had also favoured the rapid development of the United States of America.

Stassen declared that his great-grandfather had fled from Czechoslovakia because of imperialism. Of course, the geographical situation of the United States of America was a great help. "We are lucky," said Stassen, "that the enemy was defeated far away from our coasts. The United States of America was in the position to adapt itself completely, and after the war to resurrect production in great volume. Now the task is to avoid a depression and economic crisis."

Stalin asked if an economic crisis was expected in the United States of America.

Stassen answered that no economic crisis was expected. He believed that it was possible to regulate capitalism in the United States of America, to raise the level of employment to a high standard and to avoid any serious crisis. The main task lay, however, in avoiding a crisis in the economic system of the United States of America. But if the government followed a wise policy and if one took account of the lessons of the years 1929-30, there would be established regulated capitalism and not monopoly capital-

ism in the United States of America, which would help to avoid a crisis.

Stalin said that to achieve this a very strong government would be needed, which was also inspired by great determination.

Stassen said that he was right, besides which the people must understand the measures, that the stabilizing and preservation of the economic system is aimed at. That is a new task for which there is no parallel in any economic system of the world.

Stalin declared that there were favourable circumstances for the United States of America, that the two rivals of the United States of America in the world market - Japan and Germany, had been removed. Consequently, the demand for American goods had increased and that had created favourable conditions for the development of the United States of America. The markets of China and Japan were open to the United States of America, like Europe. This would help the United States of America. Such favourable conditions had never before existed.

Stassen said that on the other hand no means of payment existed in these markets, so that it would be a burden and not a profitable business for the United States of America. But of course the removal of Germany and Japan, two carriers of the imperialist danger, was a great blessing for the United States of America and for the other countries from the point of view of peace. Earlier, world trade had, of course, not been a factor of great importance

for the United States of America. Their market had been confined to the area of the United States of America or the western hemisphere.

Stalin said that before the war about 10% of American produce was exported to other countries. As far as purchasing power was concerned, he, Stalin, believed the merchants would find a means of payment, so as to buy American goods and sell them to the peasants of these countries. The merchants in China, Japan, Europe and South America had saved money. Now the United States of America will probably raise its exports to 20%. Was that correct?

Stassen said that he did not believe so.

Stalin asked: "Seriously?"

Stassen answered in the affirmative and said that if the United States of America's exports increased to 15% they would be lucky, in his opinion. Most of the merchants had saved money in their country's currency, which was all tied up and not suitable for transfer. Thus, in Stassen's opinion, the exports of the United States of America would not exceed 15%.

Stalin thought that if one considered the level of production in the United States of America, then 15% was no small figure.

Stassen agreed with that.

Stalin declared that American industry, it was said, had many orders. Was that correct? It was said that the works of the United States of America were not in the position of being able to fulfil all these orders, and that all works were functioning at 100%. Was that cor-

rect?

Stassen answered that that was correct, but that they handled the inland orders.

Stalin remarked that that was very important.

Stassen said that they succeeded in meeting the demand for food, women's clothing and shoes; the production of machinery, motor vehicles and locomotives was still lagging behind.

Stalin said that reports had appeared in the American press that an economic crisis would soon occur.

Stassen said that the press had reported that the unemployment figure in the United States of America would rise to eight million in November of last year. This report, however, had been false. The task therein was to raise production to a high level and to increase stabilization, and so avoid an economic crisis.

Stalin remarked that Stassen obviously had the regulation of production in mind.

Stassen answered that that was right and explained that there were people in America who asserted that there would be a depression. But he, Stassen, was optimistic and believed and maintained that the Americans could avoid a depression; he, Stassen, knew that the people had a deeper understanding of stronger regulation than earlier.

Stalin asked: "And the business people? Would they understand, allow such regulation and submit to restrictions?"

Stassen said that the business people would

oppose such a rule.

Stalin remarked that of course they would oppose it.

Stassen thought that they had, however, understood that the depression of 1929 must not repeat itself, and they could now see better the necessity of regulation. Of course, to be a far-reaching regulation, the government would need to make many decisions and to proceed sensibly.

Stalin remarked that he was right.

Stassen declared that it was necessary for all systems and forms of government. Under any form of government it was bad for the people if they made mistakes.

Stalin agreed to that.

Stassen said that Japan and Germany had proved this to be correct.

Stalin said that in these countries the economy had been under the control of the military, which did not understand economy. So, in Japan, for example, the economy was led by Toto, who only knew how to conduct war.

Stassen said that that was right. He thanked Stalin for giving him the possibility of speaking to him and for the time Stalin had spared him.

Stalin asked how long Stassen meant to stay in the U.S.S.R.

Stassen answered that he would be going to Kiev the next day. Upon that he wanted to express his admiration for the heroic defenders of Stalingrad and he thought after that, to leave the U.S.S.R. by way of Leningrad. During

the defence of Stalingrad he had been with the American fleet in the Pacific, where he had followed the Epopée of Stalingrad with anxious attention.

Stalin said that Admiral Niemitz was clearly a very important marine commander. Stalin asked whether Stassen had been to Leningrad yet.

Stassen said that he had not yet been to Leningrad and had the intention of leaving the U.S.S.R. by way of Leningrad.

Stalin said that the talk with Stassen had given him much.

Stassen said that the talk with Stalin had also been very useful to him for his work in the study of economic problems.

Stalin said that he had also been occupied very much with economic problems before the war and only through the compulsion of necessity was he a military specialist.

Stassen asked whether he could get and keep the protocol of the interview from Pavlov and whether he had permission to speak to reporters about the interview if he came together with one.

Stalin said that of course Stassen could keep the protocol and talk to reporters about it, - there was nothing secret about it.

("Pravda," 8 May, 1947)

GREETINGS MESSAGE TO MOSCOW

8 September, 1947

Greetings to Moscow, the capital of our country, on its 800th anniversary.

The entire country is today celebrating this significant day. It is celebrating it not formally, but with feelings of love and reverence, because of the great services Moscow has rendered our country.

The services which Moscow has rendered are not only that it thrice in the course of the history of our country liberated her from foreign oppression - from the Mongolian yoke, from Polish-Lithuanian invasion and from French incursion. The service Moscow rendered is primarily that it became the basis for uniting disunited Russia into a single state, with a single government and a single leadership. No country in the world can count on preserving its independence, on real economic and cultural growth, if it has not succeeded in liberating itself from feudal disunity and strife among princes. Only a country which is united in a single centralized state can count on the possibility of real cultural and economic growth, on the possibility of firmly establishing its independence. The historic service which Moscow rendered is that it has been and remains the basis and the initiator in the creation of a centralized state in Russia.

But this is not the only service that Moscow has rendered our country. After Moscow, by

the will of our great Lenin, was again proclaimed the capial of our country, it became the banner bearer of the new, Soviet epoch.

Moscow is today not only the inspirer in the building of the new, Soviet social and economic order, which substituted the rule of Labour for the rule of capital and rejected the exploitation of man by man. Moscow is also the herald of the movement for the liberation of toiling mankind from capitalist slavery.

Moscow is today not only the inspirer in the building of the new, Soviet democracy, which rejects all, direct or indirect, inequality of citizens, sexes, races and nations, and ensures the right to work and the right to equal pay for equal work. Moscow is also the banner of the struggle which all the working people in the world, all the oppressed races and nations, are waging to liberate themselves from the rule of plutocracy and imperialism. There can be no doubt that without this policy Moscow could not have become the centre of organization of the friendship of nations and of their fraternal co-operation in our multi-national state.

Moscow is today not only the initiator in the building of the new way of life of the working people of the capital, a life free from want and wretchedness suffered by millions of poor and unemployed. Moscow is also a model for all the capitals in the world in this respect. One of the gravest sores of the large capitals of countries in Europe, Asia and America are the slums in which millions of impoverished working

people are doomed to wretchedness and a slow and painful death. The service which Moscow has rendered is that it completely abolished these slums and gave the working people the opportunity to move out of their cellars and hovels into the apartments and houses of the bourgeoisie and into the new comfortable houses which have been built by the Soviet authorities.

Lastly, the service Moscow renders is that it is the herald of the struggle for durable peace and friendship among the nations, the herald of the struggle against the incendiaries of a new war. For the imperialists, war is the most profitable undertaking. It is not surprising that the agents of imperialism are trying, in one way or another, to provoke a new war. The service which Moscow renders is that it unceasingly exposes the incendiaries of a new war and rallies around the banner of peace all the peace-loving nations. It is common knowledge that the peace-loving nations look with hope to Moscow as the capital of the great peace-loving power and as a mighty bulwark of peace.

It is because of these services that our country is today celebrating the 800th anniversary of Moscow with such love and reverence for her capital.

Long live our mighty, beloved, Soviet, Socialist Moscow!

J. STALIN

("Soviet Calendar 1917 - 1947")

LETTER TO THE STATE PRESIDENT OF FINLAND, PAASIKIVI

Proposal of the Soviet government on the conclusion of a Soviet-Finnish Friendship, Co-operation and Support Treaty

22 February 1948

Mr. President!

As you know, two out of three of the countries bordering the U.S.S.R., that stood on the side of Germany against the U.S.S.R. during the war, namely Hungary and Rumania, have signed a support treaty against an eventual German aggression with the U.S.S.R.

As is also known, our two countries stood together strongly in sympathy throughout this aggression, in which we, together with you, bear the responsibility before our peoples if we allow the repetition of such an aggression.

I am of the opinion that a support treaty with the U.S.S.R., against an eventual German aggression is of no less interest for Finland than for Rumania and Hungary.

Out of these considerations and from the wish to create better relations between our countries for the strengthening of peace and security, the Soviet government offers the conclusion of a Soviet-Finnish Friendship, Cooperation and Support Treaty like the Hungarian-Soviet and Rumanian-Soviet treaties.

Should there be no objections from the

Finnish side, I would propose that a Finnish delegation be sent to the U.S.S.R. to conclude such a treaty.

Should it be more convenient for you to carry through the negotiations and the conclusion of the treaty in Finland, the Soviet government offers to send their delegation to Helsinki.

Yours respectfully,
J. STALIN
Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R.

("Daily Review," No. 52, 2 March, 1948)

SPEECH GIVEN AT THE DINNER IN HONOUR OF THE FINNISH GOVERNMENT DELEGATION

7 April, 1948

I would like to say a few words about the significance of the Treaty of Friendship and Mutual Help between the Soviet Union and Finland, which was signed yesterday.

This treaty signifies a change in the relations between our countries. As it is known, in the course of 150 years of relations between Russia and Finland there has been mutual distrust. The Finns distrusted the Russians, the Russians distrusted the Finns. From the Soviet side there resulted an attempt in the past to

break the distrust that stood between the Russians and the Finns. That was at the time that Lenin, in 1917, proclaimed the independence of Finland. From an historical point of view, that was an outstanding act. But sadly the distrust was not thereby broken - the distrust stayed distrust. The result was two wars between us.

I would like us to go over from the long period of mutual distrust in the course of which we went to war with each other twice, to a new period in our relations: the period of mutual trust.

It is necessary that the conclusion of this treaty breaks this distrust and builds a new basis for relations between our peoples and that it signifies a great change in the relations between our countries towards trust and friendship.

We want this acknowledged not only by those present in this hall, but also by those outside this hall, as much in Finland as in the Soviet Union.

One must not believe that the distrust between our peoples can be removed all at once. That is not done so quickly. For a long time there will be remnants of this distrust, for the abolition of which one must work and struggle hard, and to build and strengthen a tradition of mutual friendship between the U.S.S.R. and Finland.

There are treaties that are based upon equality and some that are not. The Soviet-Finnish treaty is a treaty that is based upon

equality, it has been concluded on the basis of full equality of the partners.

Many believe that between a big and little nation there cannot be relations which are based on equality. But we Soviet people are of the opinion that such relations can and should exist. We Soviet people are of the opinion that every nation, great or small, has special qualities that only they have and no other nation possesses. These peculiarities are their contribution, that every nation should contribute, to the common treasure of the culture of the world. In this sense, all nations, big and small, are in the same situation, and every nation is as equally important as the next nation.

So the Soviet people are of the opinion that Finland, although a small country, is in this treaty, as equal a partner as the Soviet Union.

You do not find many politicians of the great powers that would regard the small nations as the equals of the larger nations. Most of them look down upon the small nations. They are not disinclined, occasionally, to make a one-sided guarantee for a small nation. These politicians do not, in general, conclude treaties which depend on equality, with small nations, as they do not regard small nations as their partners.

I propose a toast to the Soviet-Finnish treaty, and to the change for the better in the relations between our countries that this treaty signifies.

("Pravda," 13 April, 1948)

ANSWER TO THE OPEN LETTER OF HENRY WALLACE

17 May, 1948

I believe that among the political documents of recent times, that have the strengthening of peace, the furthering of international cooperation and the securing of democracy as their aims, the open letter of Henry Wallace, the presidential candidate of the Third Party in the U.S.A., is the most important.

The open letter of Wallace cannot be regarded as a mere exposition of the wish to improve the international situation, as an exposition of the wish for a peaceful settlement of the differences of opinion between the Soviet Union and the U.S.A., and the wish to find a way towards such a settlement. The declaration of the government of the U.S.A. of 4 May, and the answer of the Soviet government of 9 May are, therefore, insufficient, because they do not go so far as to declare that the settlement of the Soviet-American differences of opinion is desirable.

The great importance of the open letter lies in the fact that it is not limited just to that, to giving a declaration, but rather exceeds that, - a more important step, an advance, - and proposes a concrete programme for the peaceful settlement of the differences of opinion between the Soviet Union and the U.S.A.

One cannot say that the open letter of

Wallace invariably deals with all the differences. One also cannot say that none of the formulas and opinions in the open letter need to be improved. But that is not the important thing at the moment. The important thing is that Wallace, in his letter, makes an open and honest attempt to work out a peaceful programme for a peaceful settlement and gives concrete proposals on all the points of difference between the Soviet Union and the U.S.A.

These proposals are generally known:

General limitation of armaments and the forbidding of atomic weapons. Conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany and Japan and the withdrawal of the troops from these countries.

Withdrawal of the troops from China and Korea.

Consideration for the right of nations to self-determination and non-interference in their internal affairs.

Forbidding the building of military bases in the countries that belong to the United Nations.

Development of international trade in every area, with the elimination of all discrimination.

Help and rebuilding within the framework of the United Nations for countries that suffered from the war.

Defence of democracy and the securing of civil rights in all countries, etc.

One can be for or against these proposals; but no statesman that has anything to do with

the matter of peace and cooperation of nations can ignore this programme, which reflects the hopes and longing of the peoples for the strengthening of peace, and which, without doubt, will find the support of millions of the common people.

I do not know whether the government of the U.S.A. acknowledges the programme of Wallace as a basis for understanding between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. As far as the government of the U.S.S.R. is concerned, we believe that the programme of Wallace could be a good and fruitful foundation for such understanding and for the development of international cooperation, because the government of the U.S.S.R. is of the opinion that despite the differences in their economic systems and ideologies, these systems can live side by side and that peaceful settlement of the differences between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. is not only possible, but also absolutely necessary in the interests of general peace.

("Pravda," 18 May, 1948)

GREETINGS TELEGRAM FROM STALIN AND MOLOTOV TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE CZECHOSLOVAKIAN REPUBLIC KLEMENT GOTTWALD

On the occasion of the election of Klement Gottwald as President of the Czechoslovakian Republic

17 June, 1948

Accept our sincere good wishes on the victory of people's democracy and on your election as President of the Czechoslovakian Republic.

J. STALIN - V. MOLOTOV

("Daily Review," Berlin Ed., No. 139, 17 June, 1948)

TELEGRAM TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF ITALY

On the occasion of the criminal attempt on the life of Comrade Togliatti

14 July, 1948

To the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Italy.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik) is shocked

over the criminal attempt by worthless elements on the life of the leader of the working class and all the Italian working people, our beloved Comrade Togliatti.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik) is grieved that the friends of Comrade Togliatti were unsuccessful in protecting him from the treacherous ambush.

In the name of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

J. STALIN

("Pravda," 15 July, 1948)

ANSWERING LETTER TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CABINET OF MINISTERS OF THE KOREAN PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC KIM IR SEN

On the question of the establishment of diplomatic and economic relations between the U.S.S.R. and the Korean People's Democratic Republic

12 October, 1948

To Mr. Kim Ir Sen, Chairman of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Korean People's Democratic Republic.

I confirm that I have received your letter

of 8 October, in which you inform us that the government of the Korean People's Democratic Republic steps towards exercising its duty, and proposes to establish diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R., to exchange ambassadors which also comply with the establishment of economic relations between the two states.

The Soviet government that is unchangeably for the right of the Korean people to commence the building of an united, independent state, greets the establishment of the Korean government and wishes them success in their work for the national rebirth and the democratic development of Korea. The Soviet government declares its readiness to establish diplomatic relations between the U.S.S.R. and the Korean People's Democratic Republic, to exchange ambassadors and to immediately establish complementary economic relations.

J. STALIN

("Pravda," 13 October, 1948)

ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS FROM THE "PRAVDA" CORRESPONDENT

On Berlin and the world situation

29 October, 1948

Q. How do you evaluate the results of the discussion of the Security Council on the situation in Berlin and the stand of the English-American and French representatives in this affair?

A. I evaluate it as an expression of the aggressive politics of the English-American and French government circles.

Q. Is it true that in August of this year there was already an agreement reached by the four powers on the question of Berlin?

A. Yes, it is true. As it is known, on 30 August of this year, in Moscow, an agreement was reached between the representatives of the U.S.S.R., the U.S.A., England and France, that planned simultaneous steps to repeal the limitation of traffic on one hand, and the decision to introduce the German Mark of the Soviet zone in Berlin as the only currency, on the other hand. This agreement did not violate the interests of anyone; it considered the interests of the partners and guaranteed the possibility of further cooperation. But the governments of the U.S.A. and England over-ruled their representatives in Moscow and declared this agreement invalid, that is, they violated it by the decision

to hand the question to the Security Council, where the Anglo-Americans had a sure majority.

Q. Is it true that recently in Paris, during the discussion of the question in the Security Council, an agreement on the situation in Berlin was reached in unofficial conversations, even before the Security Council had discussed this question?

A. Yes, it is true. The Argentinian representative, Mr. Brumiglia, who also functions as the Chairman of the Security Council, and who negotiated with Vyshinsky unofficially in the name of other interested powers, had in his hands a joint draft for the solution of the problems of the situation in Berlin. The representatives of the U.S.A. and England, however, again declared this agreement invalid.

Q. What is happening here? Can you not explain it?

A. What is happening is that the inspirers of the aggressive politics of the U.S.A. and England are not interested in agreement and cooperation with the U.S.S.R. They do not need an agreement or cooperation, but talk about agreement and cooperation and after they have broken the agreement, they shift the blame onto the U.S.S.R., and thereby "prove" that cooperation with the U.S.S.R. is impossible. The warmongers that strive to unleash a new war are afraid above all of agreement and cooperation with the U.S.S.R., of political agreement with the U.S.S.R., as it undermines the position of the warmongers and renders the aggressive

politics of these gentlemen obsolete.

Therefore they even break agreements that already exist, overrule their representatives that have worked out these agreements jointly with the U.S.S.R., and convey the question, in violation of the Statutes of the United Nations Organization, to the Security Council, where they have a sure majority at their disposal and where they all can "prove" everything they like. All this is done to "prove" that cooperation with the U.S.S.R. is impossible, to "prove" that a new war is necessary, and therefore create the conditions for the unleashing of war. The politics of the present leaders of the U.S.A. and England are the politics of aggression and politics for the unleashing of a new war.

Q. And how are the negotiations of the representatives of the six states in the Security Council, China, Canada, Belgium, Argentina, Columbia and Syria, evaluated?

A. It is clear that these gentlemen support the politics of aggression, the politics for the unleashing of a new war.

Q. Where can all this end?

A. It can only end in an ignominious fiasco for the warmongers. Churchill, the arch-arsonist of a new war has already reached the point where he has lost the trust of his nation and the democratic powers of the whole world. The same fate awaits all the other warmongers. The horrors of the last war still live in the minds of the peoples, and the powers that intercede for peace are so great that the supporters of

Churchill's aggression cannot overcome them and lead them in the direction of a new war.

("Pravda," 29 October, 1948)

ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS FROM THE EUROPEAN GENERAL DIRECTOR OF THE AMERICAN NEWS AGENCY "INTERNATIONAL NEWS SERVICE," KINGSBURY SMITH OF 27 JANUARY, 1949

Q. Would the government of the U.S.S.R. be prepared to consider a joint publication with the government of the United States of America, to discuss a declaration which confirms that neither the one nor the other government intends to allow a war between them?

A. The Soviet government would be prepared to discuss the question of the publication of such a document.

Q. Would the government of the U.S.S.R. be prepared, jointly with the government of the United States of America, to take steps towards the realization of this peace treaty, for example, gradual disarmament?

A. Of course the government of the U.S.-S.R. would cooperate with the government of the United States of America in the carrying through of steps for the realization of the peace treaty and gradual disarmament.

Q. If the governments of the United States of America, Great Britain and France give their consent to the postponement of the founding of a seperate West German state until the next convocation of Foreign Ministers on the subject of the German problem as a whole, would the government of the U.S.S.R. then be prepared to lift the sanctions which the Soviet administration has introduced, concerning the corridors between Berlin and the western zones of Germany?

A. In the case of the United States of America, Great Britain and France observing the conditions that are stated in the third question, the Soviet government would make no obstacles for the repeal of the transport restrictions, but under the conditions that the transport and trade restrictions that the three powers have introduced are simultaneously repealed.

Q. Would you, your Excellency, be prepared to meet President Truman at some acceptable place to discuss the possibility of concluding such a peace treaty?

A. I have already said earlier that there are no objections to such a meeting.

("Pravda," 31 January, 1949)

ANSWER TO KINGSBURY SMITH

On the question of a meeting with Truman

2 February, 1949

To Mr. Kingsbury Smith, European General Director of the "International News Service" Agency.

I have received your telegram of 1 February.

I thank President Truman for the invitation to Washington. It has long been my wish to travel to Washington, as I formerly said to President Roosevelt in Yalta and to President Truman in Potsdam. Sadly, I do not have the possibility of realizing my wish at present, as the doctor has decided against my making a long journey, especially by sea or air.

The government of the Soviet Union would greet a visit from the President to the U.S.S.R. One could hold a conference in Moscow, Leningrad or in Kaliningrad, Odessa or Yalta, whichever the President chooses, - of course, in so far as it presents no inconvenience.

However, if this proposal meets with objections, one could hold a meeting in Poland or in Czechoslovakia, at the President's convenience.

Respectfully,
J. STALIN

("New World," February 1949. P. 4)

ANSWERING TELEGRAM TO THE MINISTER PRESIDENT OF THE MONGOLIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC - MARSHAL TSHOIBALSAN

On the occasion of the third anniversary of the signing of the Friendship and Support Treaty between the U.S.S.R. and the Mongolian People's Republic

1 March, 1949

To the Prime Minister of the Mongolian People's Republic, Marshal Tshoibalsan.

I thank you, and in your person, the government of the Mongolian People's Republic for the warm congratulations on the third anniversary of the Treaty of Friendship and Support concluded between our countries.

I am convinced that because of this treaty the further development of cooperation between our countries will broaden and strengthen the basis of friendship between our peoples and will promote their prosperity.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," Berlin Ed., No. 51, 2 March, 1949)

TELEGRAM TO THE MINISTER PRESIDENT OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF POLAND JOSEF CYRANKIEWICZ

(On the occasion of the fourth anniversary of the Soviet-Polish Treaty of Friendship

21 April, 1949

On the occasion of the fourth anniversary of the Soviet-Polish Treaty of Friendship, Mutual Assistance and Cooperation after the war, I send you, Mr. Minister President, my sincere best wishes.

Accept my wishes for the further success of the Polish people and for the thriving of the Polish People's Republic, for the strengthening of the friendship and alliance between our countries.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," Berlin Ed., No. 93, 22 April, 1949)

TELEGRAM TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF BULGARIA VASSIL KOLAROFF

On the occasion of the fifth anniversary of the liberation of Bulgaria
September 1949

I greet the government of the Bulgarian People's Republic, and you personally, on the

national holiday celebrating the fifth anniversary of the liberation of Bulgaria. I send best wishes to the fraternal Bulgarian people.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," Vol. 2, No. 213, 10 September, 1949)

GREETINGS TELEGRAM TO COMRADE MARCEL CACHIN

On the occasion of his 80th Birthday

20 September, 1949

To Comrade Cachin,

Dear Comrade Cachin,

Permit me, on your 80th birthday, to congratulate you, as the founder of the Communist Party of France, as the faithful son of the French people and as the eminent leader of the international workers movement.

I wish you health and long life, for the well-being of the French people and the people of all the world.

With fraternal greetings.

J. STALIN

("Pravda," 21 September, 1949)

TELEGRAM TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC, WILHELM PIECK AND TO THE MINISTER PRESIDENT OF THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC, OTTO GROTEWOHL

On the occasion of the founding of the German Democratic Republic

13 October, 1949

To the President of the German Democratic Republic, Mr. Wilhelm Pieck.

To the Minister President of the government of the German Democratic Republic, Mr. Otto Grotewohl.

Permit me to congratulate you, and through you, the German people, on the foundation of the German Democratic Republic and on your elections as President and Minister President of the German Democratic Republic.

The founding of a German democratic, peace-loving republic is a turning point in European history. There can be no doubt that the existence of a peace-loving, democratic Germany standing next to a peace-loving Soviet Union, excludes the possibility of new wars in Europe, puts an end to bloodshed in Europe and makes it impossible for the European countries to become the slaves of world imperialism.

The experience of the last war has shown that the German and Soviet peoples have suffer-

ed most in this war, that both these peoples have the greatest potential in Europe to accomplish great deeds of world significance. If these two peoples fight for peace now, with the same determination as they fought in the war, peace in Europe will certainly be secure.

If this is the foundation for an united, democratic and peace-loving Germany, you can, at the same time, accomplish a great work for all of Europe by guaranteeing a strong peace.

You need have no doubts that if you take this road and strengthen peace, you will find great sympathy and active support from the peoples of the whole world, including also the American, English, French, Polish, Czechoslovakian and Italian people, not to speak of the peace-loving Soviet people.

I wish you success on this new, glorious path.

May the united, independent, democratic, peace-loving Germany live and prosper!

J. STALIN

("Pravda," 14 October, 1949)

ANSWERING TELEGRAM TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CABINET OF MINISTERS OF THE KOREAN PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC KIM IR SEN

On the occasion of the anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the U.S.S.R. and the Korean People's Democratic Republic

14 October, 1949

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your expression of friendship and good wishes on the anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Korean People's Democratic Republic and the U.S.S.R.

I wish the Korean people further success in the building of their People's Democratic Republic.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," No. 234, 16 October, 1949)

GREETINGS TELEGRAM TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE CZECHOSLOVAKIAN REPUBLIC ANTONIN ZAPOTOCKY

On the occasion of the thirty-first anniversary of the founding of the Czechoslovakian Republic

28 October, 1949

I send the government of the Czechoslovakian Republic and the fraternal people of

Czechoslovakia friendly greetings and also wishes for their further success.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," No. 254, 29 October, 1949)

TELEGRAM OF THANKS TO THE MINISTER PRESIDENT OF THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC, OTTO GROTEWOHL

n the occasion of the thirty-second anniversary of the Great Socialist October Revolution

November 1949

I thank you and, through you, the Provisional government of the German Democratic Republic, on behalf of the Soviet government and myself, for the congratulations on the anniversary of the Socialist October Revolution.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," No. 275, 24 November, 1949)

TELEGRAM TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE CZECHOSLOVAKIAN REPUBLIC, ANTONIN ZAPOTOCKY

On the occasion of the sixth anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Friend and Mutual Support between the U.S.S.R. and the Czechoslovakian Republic

13 December, 1949

To Mr. A. Zapotocky, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Czechoslovakian Republic.

On the sixth anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Friendship and Mutual Assistance between the U.S.S.R. and the Czechoslovakian Republic, please accept, Mr. Prime Minister, my friendly greetings to the people of the Czechoslovakian Republic, to your government and to you personally.

I wish the Czechoslovakian Republic well and the further strengthening of the alliance and friendship between the Soviet and Czechoslovakian peoples.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," No. 293, 14 December, 1949)

OPEN LETTER FROM STALIN AND HIS CLOSEST ASSOCIATES TO THE DISTRICT ELECTION COMMISSIONS

On the occasion of the elections to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. of 12 March, 1950.

17 February, 1950

Open letter to the District Election Commissions.

All of the undersigned have received telegrams from different works, kolkhozes and election councils of electors of the different areas and districts, about our nominations as deputy candidates to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. in a whole series of election districts.

We thank all the electors that nominated us as candidates for giving us their trust.

We hold it necessary, however, to declare that, by law, each of us may stand for election in only one election district; we, as Communists and members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik), have got to follow the directives of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik). The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik) has instructed us to withdraw our candidature in other districts and to stand for election in the following election districts:

Andreyev, A.A. - for the Union Soviet in the election district of Aschchabad, Turkmenian S.S.R.

Beria, L.P. - for the Union Soviet in the Stalin electoral district of the city of Tsibilisk, Georgian S.S.R.

Budyonny, S.M. - for the Union Soviet in the electoral district of Shepetovka, Ukrainian S.S.R.

Bulganin, N.A. - for the National Soviet in the Moscow city electoral district.

Voroshilov, K.E. - for the Union Soviet in the Minsk city electoral district, Byelorussian S.S.R.

Kaganovitch, L.M. - for the Union Soviet in the Lenin electoral district of the city of Tashkent, Usbek S.S.R.

Kosygin, A.N. - for the National Soviet in the Invanovo election district.

Malenkov, G.M. - for the Union Soviet in the Leningrad election district of the city of Moscow.

Mikoyan, A.J. - for the National Soviet in the Stalin electoral district of Yerevan, Armenian S.S.R.

Mikhailov, N.A. - for the National Soviet in [illegible]vropoli electoral district.

Molotov, W.M. - for the Union Soviet in the Molotov electoral district in the city of Moscow.

Ponomarenko, P.K. - for the Union Soviet in the Minsk-Land electoral district, Byelorussian S.S.R.

Stalin, J.V. - for the Union Soviet in the Stalin electoral district in the city of Moscow.

Suslov, M.A. - for the Union Soviet in the Lenin electoral district in the city of Saratov.

Krushchev, N.S. - for the Union Soviet in the Kalinin electoral district of the city of Moscow.

Shvernik, N.M. - for the National Soviet in the Sverdlovsk electoral district.

Shkiryatov, M.F. - for the National Soviet in the Tula-Ryasan electoral district.

We follow these directives of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik).

We ask the appropriate electoral districts to take notice of this declaration and to take it into consideration in their documents of registration of deputy candidates.

Andreyev, A.A., Beria, L.P., Budyonny, S.M., Bulganin, N.A., Voroshilov, K.E., Kaganovitch, L.M., Kosygin, A.N., Malenkov, G.M., Mikoyan, A.J., Mikhailov, N.A., Molotov, W.M., Ponomarenko, P.K., Stalin, J.V., Suslov, M.A., Krushchev, N.S., Shvernik, N.M., Shkiryatov, M.F.

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 43, 19 February 1950)

TELEGRAM TO THE MINISTER PRESIDENT OF THE RUMANIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC PETRU GROZA

On the occasion of the second anniversary of the signing of the Soviet-Rumanian Treaty of Friendship and Mutual Assistance

March 1950

Please accept, Mr. Minister President, my thanks for your good wishes on the second anniversary of the signing of the Soviet-Rumanian Treary of Friendship and Mutual Assistance. I am convinced that this treaty will continue to strengthen the alliance and friendship between the peoples of our countries.

Please accept my best wishes for you and for the Rumanian government.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," No. 59, 10 March, 1950)

TELEGRAM OF THANKS TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE HUNGARIAN WORKERS' PARTY AND THE HUNGARIAN GOVERNMENT AND TO THE PRAESIDIUM OF THE HUNGARIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

April 1950

I ask the Central Committee of the Hungarian Workers' Party, the Council of Ministers and the

Praesidium of the Hungarian People's Republic to accept my sincere thanks for your friendly greetings on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of the liberation of Hungary by the Soviet army.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," No. 86, 13 April, 1950)

TELEGRAM TO COMRADE MAURICE THOREZ

On the occasion of his 50th Birthday

28 April, 1950

To Comrade Maurice Thorez.

Dear Comrade Thorez!

Allow me to greet and congratulate you on your 50th birthday.

All the peoples of the world, the workers of all countries know and treasure you as the tested and true leader of the French Communists, as the leader of the French workers and working peasants in their mutual struggle for the strengthening of peace, the victory of democracy and socialism all over the world.

The Soviet people know and love you as their friend and as the steadfast fighter for the friendship and alliance of the peoples of France and the Soviet Union.

I wish you further success in your work for the well-being of the French people and for all the working people of the world.

Fraternal greetings.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 100, 29 April, 1950)

TELEGRAM TO THE MINISTER PRESIDENT OF THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OTTO GROTEWOHL

On the occasion of the fifth anniversary of the liberation of the German people from the fascist tyranny

11 May, 1950

To the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic, Mr. Otto Grotewohl.

I thank you and, through you, the government of the German Democratic Republic, for your message of greetings on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of the liberation of the German people from the fascist tyranny.

I am convinced that the friendly relations between the German Democratic Republic and the Soviet Union will further develop successfully for the well-being of our peoples and in the interests of the peace and cooperation of all peace-loving countries.

J. STALIN

("New World," May 1950. P. 1)

LETTER TO THE MINISTER PRESIDENT OF THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OTTO GROTEWOHL

On the reduction of Germany's reparation payments

15 May, 1950

To the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic, Mr. Otto Grotewohl.

Dear Mr. Minister President,

The Soviet government has examined the request of the government of the German Democratic Republic on the reduction of the reparation sum to be paid by Germany.

The Soviet government has, at the same

time, borne in mind that the German Democratic Republic has been conscientious and regular in their fulfilment of their reparation obligation, which is charged as high as 10 billion dollars, and that by the end of 1950 an important part of this obligation, as much as 3658 million dollars, will have been realized.

Led by the wish to ease the efforts of the German people in the reconstruction and development of the people's economy in Germany, and bearing in mind the friendly relations between the Soviet Union and the German Democratic Republic, the Soviet government has decided, with the agreement of the government of the Polish Republic, to reduce the remaining sum of the reparation bill by 50%, to 3171 million dollars.

In agreement with the declaration of the government of the U.S.S.R. at the Moscow Conference of Foreign Ministers in Marc[illegible] and the settlement of a twenty year term for the payment of reparation, the Soviet government has further decided to accept payment of the remaining part of the reparation bill in German goods (as much as 3171 million dollars) out of the production of fifteen years running, starting with the year 1951 up to the year 1965, inclusive.

With deep esteem,

J. STALIN

Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R.

("Daily Review," No. 113, 17 May, 1950)

TELEGRAM TO THE CENTRAL COUNCIL OF THE FREE GERMAN YOUTH

2 June, 1950

To the Central Council of the Free German Youth.

I thank the young German peace fighters, members of the All-German Youth Conference, for their greetings.

I wish the German youth, the active builders of an united, democratic and peace-loving Germany, success in this great work.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 125, 2 June, 1950)

MARXISM AND PROBLEMS OF LINGUISTICS

1950

CONCERNING MARXISM IN LINGUISTICS

A group of younger comrades have asked me to give my opinion in the press on problems relating to linguistics, particularly in reference to Marxism in linguistics. I am not a linguistic expert and, of course, cannot fully satisfy the request of the comrades. As to Marxism in linguistics, as in other social sciences, this is something directly in my field. I have therefore consented to answer a number of questions put by the comrades.

Q. Is it true that language is a superstructure on the basis?

A. No, it is not true.

The basis is the economic structure of society at the given stage of its development. The superstructure is the political, legal, religious, artistic, philosophical views of society and the political, legal and other institutions corresponding to them.

Every basis has its own corresponding superstructure. The basis of the feudal system has its superstructure, its political, legal and other views, and the corresponding institutions; the capitalist basis has its own superstructure, so has the socialist basis. If the basis changes or is eliminated, then, following this, its superstructure changes or is eliminated; if a new basis arises,

then, following this, a superstructure arises corresponding to it.

In this respect language radically differs from the superstructure. Take, for example, Russian society and the Russian language. In the course of the past thirty years the old, capitalist basis has been eliminated in Russia and a new, socialist basis has been built. Correspondingly, the superstructure on the capitalist basis has been eliminated and a new superstructure created corresponding to the socialist basis. The old political, legal and other institutions, consequently, have been supplanted by new, socialist institutions. But in spite of this the Russian language has remained basically what it was before the October Revolution.

What has changed in the Russian language in this period? To a certain extent the vocabulary of the Russian language has changed, in the sense that it has been replenished with a considerable number of new words and expressions, which have arisen in connection with the rise of the new socialist production, the appearance of a new state, a new socialist culture, new social relations and morals, and, lastly, in connection with the development of technology and science; a number of words and expressions have changed their meaning, have acquired a new signification; a number of obsolete words have dropped out of the vocabulary. As to the basic stock of words and the grammatical system of the Russian language, which constitute the foundation of a language, they, after the elimination of

the capitalist basis, far from having been eliminated and supplanted by a new basic word stock and a new grammatical system of the language, have been preserved in their entirety and have not undergone any serious changes - they have been preserved precisely as the foundation of the modern Russian language.

Further, the superstructure is a product of the basis, but this by no means implies that it merely reflects the basis, that it is passive, neutral, indifferent to the fate of its basis, to the fate of the classes, to the character of the system. On the contrary, having come into being, it becomes an an exceedingly active force, actively assisting its basis to take shape and consolidate itself, and doing its utmost to help the new system to finish off and eliminate the old basis and the old classes.

It cannot be otherwise. The superstructure is created by the basis precisely in order to serve it, to actively help it to take shape and consolidate itself, to actively fight for the elimination of the old, moribund basis together with its old superstructure. The superstructure has only to renounce this role of auxiliary, it has only to pass from a position of active defence of its basis to one of indifference towards it, to adopt an equal attitude to all classes, and it loses its virtue and ceases to be a superstructure.

In this respect language radically differs from the superstructure. Language is not a product of one or another basis, old or new, within the given society, but of the whole course of

the hisory of the society and of the history of the bases for many centuries. It was created not by some one class, but by the entire society, by all the classes of the society, by the efforts of hundreds of generations. It was created for the satisfaction of the needs not of one particular class, but of the entire society, of all the classes of the society. Precisely for this reason it was created as a single language for the society, common to all members of that society, as the common language of the whole people. Hence the functional role of language, as a means of intercourse between people, consists not in serving one class to the detriment of other classes, but in equally serving the entire society, all the classes of society. This in fact explains why a language may equally serve both the old, moribund system and the new, rising system; both the old basis and the new basis; both the exploiters and the exploited.

It is no secret to anyone that the Russian language served Russian capitalism and Russian bourgeois culture before the October Revolution just as well as it now serves the socialist system and socialist culture of Russian society.

The same must be said of the Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Uzbek, Kazakh, Georgian, Armenian, Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Moldavian, Tatar, Azerbaijanian, Bashkirian, Turkmenian and other languages of the Soviet nations; they served the old, bourgeois system of these nations just as well as they serve the new, socialist system.

It cannot be otherwise. Language exists, language has been created precisely in order to serve society as a whole, as a means of intercourse between people, in order to be common to the members of society and constitute the single language of society, serving members of society equally, irrespective of their class status. A language has only to depart from this position of being a language common to the whole people, it has only to give preference and support to some one social group to the detriment of other social groups of the society, and it loses its virtue, ceases to be a means of intercourse between the people of the society, and becomes the jargon of some social group, degenerates and is doomed to disappear.

In this respect, while it differs in principle from the superstructure, language does not differ from instruments of production, from machines, let us say, which are as indifferent to classes as is language and may, like it, equally serve a capitalist system and a socialist system.

Further, the superstructure is the product of one epoch, the epoch in which the given economic basis exists and operates. The superstructure is therefore short lived; it is eliminated and disappears with the elimination and disappearance of the given basis.

Language, on the contrary, is the product of a whole number of epochs, in the course of which it takes shape, is enriched, develops and is smoothened. A language therefore lives immeasurably longer than any basis or superstruct-

ure. This in fact explains why the rise and elimination not only of one basis and its superstructure, but of several bases and their corresponding superstructures, have not led in history to the elimination of a given language, to the elimination of its structure and the rise of a new language with a new stock of words and a new grammatical system.

It is more than a hundred years since Pushkin died. In this period the feudal system and the capitalist system were eliminated in Russia, and a third, a socialist system has arisen. Hence two bases, with their superstructures, were eliminated, and a new, socialist basis has arisen, with its new superstructure. Yet, if we take the Russian language, for example, it has not in this long span of time undergone any fundamental change, and the modern Russian language differs very little in structure from the language of Pushkin.

What has changed in the Russian language in this period? The Russian vocabulary has in this period been greatly replenished;a large number of obsolete words have dropped out of the vocabulary; the meaning of a great many words has changed; the grammatical system of the language has improved. As to the structure of Pushkin's language, with its grammatical system and its basic stock of words, in all essentials it has remained as the basis of modern Russian.

And this is quite understandable. Indeed, what necessity is there, after every revolution, for the existing structure of the language, its

grammatical system and basic stock of words to be destroyed and supplanted by new ones, as is usually the case with the superstructure?What object would there be in calling "water," "earth," "mountain," "forest," "fish," "man," "to walk," "to do," "to produce," "to trade," etc., not water, earth, mountain, etc., but something else? What object would there be in having the modification of words in a language and the combination of words in sentences follow not the existing grammar, but some entirely different grammar? What would the revolution gain from such an upheaval in language? History in general never does anything of any importance without some special necessity for it. What, one asks, can be the necessity for such a linguistic revolution, if it has been demonstrated that the existing language and its structure are fundamentally quite suited to the needs of the new system? The old superstructure can and should be destroyed and replaced by a new one in the course of a few years, in order to give free scope for the development of the productive forces of society; but how can an existing language be destroyed and a new one built in its place in the course of a few years without causing anarchy in social life and without creating the threat of the disintegration of society? Who but a Don Quixote could set himself such a task?

Lastly, one other radical distinction between the superstructure and language. The superstructure is not directly connected with pro-

duction, with man's productive activity. It is connected with production only indirectly, through the economy, through the basis. The superstructure therefore reflects changes in the level of development of the productive forces not immediately and not directly, but only after changes in the basis, through the prism of the changes wrought in the basis by the changes in production. This means that the sphere of action of the superstructure is narrow and limited.

Language, on the contrary, is connected with man's productive activity directly, and not only with man's productive activity, but with all his other activity in all his spheres of work, from production to the basis, and from the basis to the superstructure. For this reason language reflects changes in production immediately and directly, without waiting for changes in the basis. For this reason the sphere of action of language, which embraces all fields of man's activity, is far broader and more comprehensive than the sphere of action of the superstructure. More, it is practically unlimited.

It is this that primarily explains why language, or rather its vocabulary, is in a state of almost constant change. The continuous development of industry and agriculture, of trade and transport, of technology and science, demands that language should replenish its vocabulary with new words and expressions needed for their functioning. And language, directly reflecting these needs, does replenish its vocabulary with new words, and perfects its grammatical

system.

Hence:

a) A Marxist cannot regard language as a superstructure on the basis.

b) To confuse language and superstructure is to commit a serious error.

Q. Is it true that language always was and is class language, that there is no such thing as language which is the single and common language of a society, a non-class language common to the whole people?

A. No, it is not true.

It is not difficult to understand that in a society which has no classes there can be no such thing as a class language. There were no classes in the primitive communal clan system, and consequently there could be no class language - the language was then the single and common language of the whole community. The objection that the concept class should be taken as covering every human community, including the primitive communal community, is not an objection but a playing with words that is not worth refuting.

As to the subsequent development from clan languages to tribal languages, from tribal languages to the languages of nationalities, and from the languages of nationalities to national languages - everywhere and at all stages of development, language as a means of intercourse between the people of a society, was the common and single language of that society, serving its members equally, irespective of their social

status.

I am not referring here to the empires of the slave and mediaeval periods, the empires of Cyrus or Alexander the Great, let us say, or of Caesar or Charles the Great, which had no economic foundations of their own and were transient and unstable military and administrative associations. Not only did these empires not have, they could not have had a single language common to the whole empire and understood by all the members of the empire. They were conglomerations of tribes and nationalities, each of which lived its own life and had its own language. Consequently, it is not these or similar empires I have in mind, but the tribes and nationalities composing them, which had their own economic foundations and their own languages, evolved in the distant past. History tells us that the languages of these tribes and nationalities were not class languages, but languages common to the whole of a tribe or nationality, and understood by all its people.

Side by side with this, there were, of course, dialects, local vernaculars, but they were dominated by and subordinated to the single and common language of the tribe or nationality.

Later, with the appearance of capitalism, the elimination of feudal division and the formation of national markets, nationalities developed into nations, and the languages of nationalities into national languages. History shows that national languages are not class, but common languages, common to all the members of each nation and constituting the single language of that nation.

It has been said above that language, as a means of intercourse between the people of a society, serves all classes of society equally, and in this respect displays what may be called an indifference to classes. But people, the various social groups, the classes, are far from being indifferent to language. They strive to utilize the language in their own interests, to impose their own special lingo, their own special terms, their own special expressions upon it. The upper strata of the propertied classes, who have divorced themselves from and detest the people - the aristocratic nobility, the upper strata of the bourgeoisie - particularly distinguish themselves in this respect. "Class" dialects, jargons, high-society "languages" are created. These dialects and jargons are often incorrectly referred to in literature as languages - the "aristocratic language" or the "bourgeois language" in contradistinction to the "proletarian language" or the "peasant language." For this reason, strange as it may seem, some of our comrades have come to the conclusion that national language is a fiction, and that only class languages exist in reality.

There is nothing, I think, more erroneous than this conclusion. Can these dialects and jargons be regarded as languages? Certainly not. They cannot, firstly, because these dialects and jargons have no grammatical systems or basic

word stocks of their own - they borrow them from the national language. They cannot, secondly, because these dialects and jargons are confined to a narrow sphere, are current only among the upper strata of a given class and are entirely unsuitable as a means of human intercourse for society as a whole. What, then, have they? They have a collection of specific words reflecting the specific tastes of the aristocracy or the upper strata of the bourgeoisie; a certain number of expressions and turns of phrase distinguished by refinement and gallantry and free of the "coarse" expressions and turns of phrase of the national language; lastly, a certain number of foreign words. But all the fundamentals, that is, the overwhelming majority of the words and the grammatical system, are borrowed from the common, national language. Dialects and jargons are therefore off-shoots of the common national language, devoid of all linguistic independence and doomed to stagnation. To believe that dialects and jargons can develop into independent languages capable of ousting and supplanting the national language means losing one's sense of historical perspective and abandoning the Marxist position.

References are made to Marx, and the passage from his article "St. Max" is quoted which says that the bourgeois "their own language," that this language "is a product of the bourgeoisie," that it is permeated with the spirit of mercantilism and huckstering. Certain comrades cite this passage with the idea of proving that

Marx believed in the "class character" of language and denied the existence of a single national language. If these comrades were impartial, they should have cited another passage from this same article "St. Max," where Marx, touching on the ways single national languages arose, speaks of "the concentration of dialects into a single national language resulting from economic and political concentration."

Marx, consequently, did recognize the necessity of a single national language, as a higher form, to which dialects, as lower forms, are subordinate.

What, then, can this bourgeois language be which Marx says "is a product of of the bourgeoisie"? Did Marx consider it as much a language as the national language, with a specific linguistic structure of its own? Could he have considered it such a language? Of course not. Marx merely wanted to say that the bourgeois had polluted the single national language with their hucksters' lingo, that the bourgeois, in other words, have their hucksters' jargon.

It thus appears that these comrades have misrepresented Marx. And they misrepresented him because they quoted Marx not like Marxists but like dogmatists, without delving into the essence of the matter.

References are made to Engels, and the words from his "The Condition of the Working-Class in England" are cited where he says that in Britain "...the working-class has gradually become a race wholly apart from the English bour-

geoisie," that "the workers speak other dialects, have other thoughts and ideals, other customs and moral principles, a different religion and other politics than those of the bourgeoisie." Certain comrades conclude from this passage that Engels denied the necessity of a common national language, that he believed, consequently, in the "class character" of language. True, Engels speaks here of dialects, not languages, fully realizing that, being an offshoot of the national language, a dialect cannot supplant the national language. But apparently these comrades regard the existence of a difference between a language and a dialect with no particular enthusiasm.

It is obvious that the quotation is inappropriate, because Engels speaks here not of "class languages" but chiefly of class thoughts, ideals, customs, moral principles, religion, politics. It is perfectly true that the thoughts, ideals, customs, moral principles, religion and politics of bourgeois and proletarians are directly antithetical. But what has this to do with national language, or the "class character" of language? Can the existence of class antagonisms in society serve as an argument in favour of the "class character" of language, or against the necessity of a single national language? Marxism says that a common language is one of the cardinal ear-marks of a nation, although knowing very well that there are class antagonisms within the nation. Do the comrades referred to recognize this Marxist thesis?

References are made to Lafargue, and it is said that in his pamphlet "The French Langauge Before and After the Revolution" he recognizes the "class character" of language and denies the necessity of a national language common to the whole people. That is not true. Lafargue does indeed speak of a "noble" or "aristocratic language" and of the "jargons" of various strata of society. But these comrades forget that Lafargue, who was not interested in the difference between languages and jargons and referred to dialects now as "artificial languages," now as "jargons," definitely says in this pamphlet that "the artificial language which distinguished the aristocracy ...arose out of the language common to the whole people, which was spoken both by bourgeois and artisan, by town and country."

Consequently, Lafargue recognizes the existence and necessity of a common language of the whole people, and fully realizes that the "aristocratic language" and other dialects and jargons are subordinate to and dependent on the language common to the whole people.

It follows that the reference to Lafargue is wide of the mark.

References are made to the fact that at one time in England the feudal lords spoke "for centuries" in French, while the English people spoke English, and this is alleged to be an argument in favour of the "class character" of language and against the necessity of a language common to the whole people. But this is not an

argument, it is rather an anecdote. Firstly, not all the feudal lords spoke French at that time, but only a small upper stratum of English feudal lords attached to the court and at county seats. Secondly, it was not some "class language" they spoke, but the ordinary language common to all the French people. Thirdly, we know that in the course of time this French language fad disappeared without a trace, yielding place to the English language common to the whole people. Do these comrades think that the English feudal lords "for centuries" held intercourse with the English people through interpreters, that they did not use the English language, that there was no language common to all the English at that time, and that the French language in England was then anything more than the language of high society, current only in the restricted circle of the upper English aristocracy? How can one possibly deny the existence and the necessity of a language common to the whole people on the basis of anecdotic "arguments" like these?

There was a time when Russian aristocrats at the tsar's court and in high society also made a fad of the French language. They prided themselves on the fact that when they spoke Russian they often lapsed into French, that they could only speak Russian with a French accent. Does this mean that there was no Russian language common to the whole people at that time in Russia, that a language common to the whole people was a fiction, and "class languages" a

reality?

Our comrades are here committing at least two mistakes.

The first mistake is that they confuse language with superstructure. They think that since the superstructure has a class character, language too must be a class language, and not a language common to the whole people. But I have already said that language and superstructure are two different concepts, and that a Marxist must not confuse them.

The second mistake of these comrades is that they conceive the opposition of interests of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, the fierce class struggle between them, as meaning the disintegration of society, as a break of all ties between the hostile classes. They believe that, since society has disintegrated and there is no longer a single society, but only classes, a single language of society, a national language, is unnecessary. If society has disintegrated and there is no longer a language common to the whole people, a national language, what remains? There remain classes and "class languages." Naturally, every "class language" will have its "class" grammar - a "proletarian" grammar or a "bourgeois" grammar. True, such grammars do not exist anywhere. But that does not worry these comrades: they believe that such grammars will appear in due course.

At one time there were "Marxists" in our country who asserted that the railways left to us after the October Revolution were bourgeois

railways, that it would be unseemly for us Marxists to use them, that they should be torn up and new, "proletarian" railways built. For this they were nicknamed "troglodytes"....

It goes without saying that such a primitive-anarchist view of society, of classes, of language has nothing in common with Marxism. But it undoubtedly exists and continues to prevail in the minds of certain of our muddled comrades.

It is of course wrong to say that, because of the existence of a fierce class struggle, society has split up into classes which are no longer economically connected with one another in one society. On the contrary, as long as capitalism exists, the bourgeois and the proletarians will be bound together by every economic thread as parts of a single capitalist society. The bourgeois cannot live and enrich themselves unless they have wage-labourers at their command; the proletarians cannot survive unless they hire themselves to the capitalists. If all economic ties between them were to cease, it would mean the cessation of all production, and the cessation of all production would mean the doom of society, the doom of the classes themselves. Naturally, no class wants to incur self-destruction. Consequently, however sharp the class struggle may be, it cannot lead to the disintegration of society. Only ignorance of Marxism and complete failure to understand the nature of language could have suggested to some of our comrades, the fairy-tale about the disintegration of society, about "class" languages,

and "class" grammars.

Reference is further made to Lenin, and it is pointed out that Lenin recognized the existence of two cultures under capitalism - bourgeois and proletarian - and that the slogan of national culture under capitalism is a nationalist slogan. All this is true and Lenin is absolutely right here. But what has this to do with the "class character" of language? When these comrades refer to what Lenin said about two cultures under capitalism, it is evidently with the idea of suggesting to the reader that the existence of two cultures, bourgeois and proletarian, in society means that there must also be two languages, inasmuch as language is linked with culture - and, consequently, that Lenin denies the necessity of a single national language, and, consequently, that Lenin believes in "class" languages. The mistake these comrades make here is that they identify and confuse language with culture. But culture and language are two different things. Culture may be bourgeois or socialist, but language, as a means of intercourse, is always a language common to the whole people and can serve both bourgeois and socialist culture. Is it not a fact that the Russian, the Ukrainian, the Uzbek languages are now serving socialist culture of these nations just as well as they served their bourgeois cultures before the October Revolution? Consequently, these comrades are profoundly mistaken when they assert that the existence of two different cultures leads to the formation of two different lan-

guages and to the negation of the necessity of a single language.

When Lenin spoke of two cultures, he proceeded precisely from the thesis that the existence of two cultures cannot lead to the negation of a single language and to the formation of two languages, that there must be a single language. When the Bundists accused Lenin of denying the necessity of a national language and of regarding culture as "non-national," Lenin, as we know, vigorously protested and declared that he was fighting against bourgeois culture, and not against national languages, the necessity of which he regarded as indisputable. It is strange that some of our comrades should be trailing in the footsteps of the Bundists.

As to a single language, the necessity of which Lenin is alleged to deny, it would be well to pay heed to the following words of Lenin:

"Language is the most important means of human intercourse. Unity of language and its unimpeded development form one of the most important conditions for genuinely free and extensive commercial intercourse appropriate to modern capitalism, for a free and broad grouping of the population in all its seperate classes."

It follows that our highly respected comrades have misrepresented the views of Lenin.

Reference, lastly, is made to Stalin. The passage from Stalin is quoted which says that "the bourgeoisie and its nationalist parties were and remain in this period the chief directing force of such nations." This is all true. The bour-

geoisie and its nationalist party really do direct bourgeois culture, just as the proletariat and its internationalist party direct proletarian culture. But what has this to do with the "class character" of language? Do not these comrades know that national language is a form of national culture, that a national language may serve both bourgeois and socialist culture? Are our comrades unaware of the well-known formula of the Marxists that the present Russian, Ukrainian, Byelorussian and other cultures are socialist in content and national in form, i.e., in language? Do they agree with this Marxist formula?

The mistake our comrades commit here is that they do not see the difference between culture and language, and do not understand that culture changes in content with every new period in the development of society, whereas language remains basically the same through a number of periods, equally serving both the new culture and the old.

Hence:

a) Language, as a means of intercourse, always was and remains the single language of a society, common to all its members;

b) The existence of dialects and jargons does not negate but confirms the existence of a language common to the whole of the given people, of which they are offshoots and to which they are subordinate;

c) The "class character" of language formula is erroneous and non-Marxist.

Q. What are the characteristic features of language?

A. Language is one of those social phenomena which operate throughout the existence of a society. It arises and develops with the rise and development of society. It dies when the society dies. Apart from society there is no language. Accordingly, language and its laws of development can be understood only if studied in inseperable connection with the history of society, with the history of the people to whom the language under study belongs, and who are its creators and repositories.

Language is a medium, an instrument with the help of which people communicate with one another, exchange thoughts and understand each other. Being directly connected with thinking, language registers and fixes in words, and in words combined into sentences, the results of the process of thinking and achievements of man's cognitive activity, and thus makes possible the exchange of thoughts in human society.

Exchange of thoughts is a constant and vital necessity, for without it, it is impossible to co-ordinate the joint actions of people in the struggle against the forces of nature, in the struggle to produce the necessary material values; without it, it is impossible to ensure the success of society's productive activity, and, hence, the very existence of social production becomes impossible. Consequently, without a language understood by a society and common to all its members, that society must cease to produce, must disintegrate and cease to exist as a society. In this sense, language, while it is a medium of intercourse, is at the same time an instrument of struggle and development of society.

As we know, all the words in a language taken together constitute what is known as its vocabulary. The chief thing in the vocabulary of a language is its basic stock of words, which includes also all the root words, as its kernel. It is far less extensive than the language's vocabulary, but it persists for for a very long time, for centuries, and provides the language with a basis for the formation of new words. The vocabulary reflects the state of the language: the richer and more diversified the vocabulary, the richer and more developed the language.

However, by itself, the vocabulary does not constitute the language - it is rather the building material of the language. Just as in construction work the building materials do not constitute the building, although the latter cannot be constructed without them, so too the vocabulary of a language does not constitute the language itself, although no language is conceivable without it. But the vocabulary of a language assumes tremendous importance when it comes under the control of grammar, which defines the rules governing the modification of words and the combination of words into sentences, and thus makes the language a coherent and significant function. Grammar (morphology, syntax) is the collection of rules governing the modifica-

tion of words and their combination into sentences. It is therefore thanks to grammar that it becomes possible for language to invest man's thoughts in a material linguistic integument.

The distinguishing feature of grammar is that it gives rules for the modification of words not in reference to concrete words, but to words in general, not taken concretely; that it gives rules for the formation of sentences not in reference to particular concrete sentences - with, let us say, a concrete subject, a concrete predicate, etc. - but to all sentences in general, irrespective of the concrete form of any sentence in particular. Hence, abstracting itself, as regards both words and sentences, from the particular and concrete, grammar takes that which is common and basic in the modification of words and their combination into sentences and builds it into grammatical rules, grammatical laws. Grammar is the outcome of a process of abstraction performed by the human mind over a long period of time; it is an indication of the tremendous achievement of thought.

In this respect grammar resembles geometry, which in giving its laws abstracts itself from concrete objects, regarding objects as bodies devoid of concreteness, and defining the relations between them not as the concrete relations of concrete objects but as the relations of bodies in general, devoid of all concreteness.

Unlike the superstructure, which is connected with production not directly, but through the economy, language is directly connected with

man's productive activity, as well as with all his other activity in all his spheres of work without exception. That is why the vocabulary of a language, being the most sensitive to change, is in a state of almost constant change, and, unlike the superstructure, language does not have to wait until the basis is eliminated, but makes changes in its vocabulary before the basis is eliminated and irrespective of the state of the basis.

However, the vocabulary of a language does not change in the way the superstructure does, that is, by abolishing the old and building something new, but by replenishing the existing vocabulary with new words which arise with changes in the social system, with the development of production, of culture, science, etc. Moreover, although a certain number of obsolete words usually drop out of the vocabulary of a language, a far larger stock of new words are added. As to the basic word stock, it is preserved in all its fundamentals and is used as the basis for the vocabulary of the language.

This is quite understandable. There is no necessity to destroy the basic word stock when it can be effectively used through the course of several historical periods; not to speak of the fact that, it being impossible to create a new basic word stock in a short time, the destruction of the basic word stock accumulated in the course of centuries would result in paralysis of the language, in the complete disruption of intercourse between people.

The grammatical system of a language changes even more slowly than its basic word stock. Elaborated in the course of epochs, and having become part of the flesh and blood of the language, the grammatical system changes still more slowly than the basic word stock. With the lapse of time it, of course, undergoes changes, becomes more perfected, improves its rules, makes them more specific and acquires new rules; but the fundamentals of the grammatical system are preserved for a very long time, since, as history shows, they are able to serve society effectively through a succession of epochs.

Hence, grammatical system and basic word stock constitute the foundation of language, the essence of its specific character.

History shows that languages possess great stability and a tremendous power of resistance to forcible assimilation. Some historians, instead of explaining this phenomenon, confine themselves to expressing their surprise at it. But there is no reason for surprise whatsoever. Languages owe their stability to the stability of their grammatical systems and basic word stocks. The Turkish assimilators strove for hundreds of years to mutilate, shatter and destroy the languages of the Balkan peoples. During this period the vocabulary of the Balkan languages underwent considerable change; quite a few Turkish words and expressions were absorbed; there were "convergencies" and "divergencies." Nevertheless, the Balkan languages held their own and

survived. Why? Because their grammatical systems and basic word stocks were in the main preserved.

It follows from all this that a language, its structure, cannot be regarded as the product of some one epoch. The structure of a language, its grammatical system and basic word stock, is the product of a number of epochs.

We may assume that the rudiments of modern language already existed in hoary antiquity, before the epoch of slavery. It was a rather simple language with a very meagre stock of words, but with a grammatical system of its own - true, a primitive one, but a grammatical system nonetheless.

The further development of production, the appearance of classes, the introduction of writing, the rise of the state, which needed a more or less well-regulated correspondence for its administration, the development of trade, which needed a well-regulated correspondence still more, the appearance of the printing press, the development of literature - all this caused big changes in the development of language. During this time, tribes and nationalities broke up and scattered, intermingled and intercrossed; later there arose national languages and states, revolutions took place, and old social systems were replaced by new ones. All this caused even greater changes in language and its development.

However, it would be a profound mistake to think that language developed in the way the

superstructure developed - by the destruction of that which existed and the building of something new. In point of fact, languages did not develop by the destruction of existing languages and the creation of new ones, but by extending and perfecting the basic elements of existing languages. And the transition of the language from one quality to another did not take the form of an explosion, of the destruction at one blow of the old and the creation of the new, but of the gradual and long-continued accumulation of the elements of the new quality, of the new linguistic structure, and the gradual dying away of the elements of the old quality.

It is said that the theory that languages develop by stages is a Marxist theory, since it recognizes the necessity of sudden explosions as a condition for the transition of a language from an old quality a new. This is of course untrue, for it is difficult to find anything resembling Marxism in this theory. And if the theory of stages really does recognize sudden explosions in the history of the development of languages, so much the worse for that theory. Marxism does not recognize sudden explosions in the development of languages, the sudden death of an existing language and the sudden erection of a new language. Lafargue was wrong when he spoke of a "sudden linguistic revolution which took place between 1789 and 1794" in France (see Lafargue's pamphlet "The French Language Before and After the Revolution"). There was no linguistic revolution, let alone a sudden one, in

France at that time. True enough, during that period the vocabulary of the French language was replenished with new words and expressions, a certain number of obsolete words dropped out of it, and the meaning of certain words changed - but that was all. Changes of this nature, however, by no means determine the destiny of a language. The chief thing in a language is its grammatical system and basic word stock. But far from disappearing in the period of the French bourgeois revolution, the grammatical system and basic word stock of the French language were preserved without substantial change, and not only were they preserved, but they continue to exist in the French language of today. I need hardly say that five or six years is a ridiculously small period for the elimination of an existing language and the building of a new national language ("a sudden linguistic revolution"!) - centuries are needed for this.

Marxism holds that the transition of a language from an old quality to a new does not take place by means of an explosion, of the destruction of an existing language and the creation of a new one, but by the gradual accumulation of the elements of the new quality, and hence by the gradual dying away of the elements of the old quality.

It should be said in general for the benefit of comrades who have an infatuation for explosions that the law of transition from an old quality to a new by means of an explosion is inapplicable not only to the history of the de-

velopment of languages; it is not always applicable to other social phenomena of a basis or superstructural character. It applies of necessity to a society divided into hostile classes. But it does not necessarily apply to a society which has no hostile classes. In a period of eight to ten years we effected a transition in the agriculture of our country from the bourgeois, individual-peasant system to the socialist, collective-farm system. This was a revolution which eliminated the old bourgeois economic system in the countryside and created a new, socialist system. But that revolution did not take place by means of an explosion, that is, by the overthrow of the existing government power and the creation of a new power, but by a gradual transition from the old bourgeois system in the countryside to a new system. And it was possible to do that because it was a revolution from above, because the revolution was accomplished on the initiative of the existing power with the support of the bulk of the peasantry.

It is said that the numerous instances of linguistic crossing in past history furnish reason to believe that when languages cross a new language is formed by means of an explosion, by a sudden transition from an old quality to a new. This is quite wrong.

Linguistic crossing cannot be regarded as the single impact of a decisive blow which produces its results within a few years. Linguistic crossing is a prolonged process which continues

for hundreds of years. There can therefore be no question of explosion here.

Further, it would be quite wrong to think that the crossing of, say, two languages results in a new, third language which does not resemble either of the languages crossed and differs qualitatively from both of them. As a matter of fact one of the languages usually emerges victorious from the cross, retains its grammatical system and its basic word stock and continues to develop in accordance with its inherent laws of development, while the other language gradually loses its quality and gradually dies away.

Consequently, a cross does not result in some new, third language; one of the languages persists, retains its grammatical system and basic word stock and is able to develop in accordance with its inherent laws of development.

True, in the process the vocabulary of the victorious language is somewhat enriched from the vanquished language, but this strengthens rather than weakens it.

Such was the case, for instance, with the Russian language, with which, in the course of historical development, the languages of a number of other peoples crossed and which always emerged the victor.

Of course, in the process the vocabulary of the Russian language was enlarged at the expense of the vocabularies of the other languages, but far from weakening, this enriched and strengthened the Russian language.

As to the specific national individuality of the Russian language, it did not suffer in the slightest, because the Russian language preserved its grammatical system and basic word stock and continued to advance and perfect itself in accordance with its inherent laws of development.

There can be no doubt that the crossing theory has little or no value for Soviet linguistics. If it is true that the chief task of linguistics is to study the inherent laws of language development, it has to be admitted that the crossing theory does not even set itself this task, let alone accomplish it - it simply does not notice it, or does not understand it.

Q. Did "Pravda" act rightly in starting an open discussion on problems of linguistics?

A. Yes, it did.

Along what lines the problems of linguistics will be settled, will become clear at the conclusion of the discussion. But it may be said already that the discussion has been very useful.

It has brought out, in the first place, that linguistic bodies both in the centre and in republics a regime has prevailed which is [illegible] to science and men of science. The slightest criticism of the state of affairs in Soviet linguistics, even the most timid attempt to criticise the so-called "new doctrine" in linguistics, was persecuted and suppressed by the leading linguistic circles. Valuable workers and researchers in linguistics were dismissed from their posts or demoted for being critical of

N.Y. Marr's heritage or expressing the slightest disapproval of his teachings. Linguistic scholars were appointed to leading posts not on their merits, but because of their unqualified acceptance of N.Y. Marr's theories.

It is generally recognized that no science can develop and flourish without a battle of opinions, without freedom of criticism. But this generally recognized rule was ignored and flouted in the most unceremonious fashion. There arose a close group of infallible leaders, who, having secured themselves against any possible criticism, became a law unto themselves and did whatever they pleased.

To give one example: the so-called "Baku Course" (lectures delivered by N.Y. Marr in Baku), which the author himself had rejected and forbidden to be republished, was republished nevertheless by order of this leading caste (Comrade Meshchaninov calls them "disciples" of N.Y. Marr) and included without any reservations in the list of text-books recommended to students. This means that the students were deceived, a rejected "Course" being suggested to them as a sound text-book. If I were not convinced of the integrity of Comrade Meshchaninov and the other linguistic leaders, I would say that such conduct is tantamount to sabotage.

How could this have happened? It happened because the Arakcheyev regime established in linguistics cultivates irresponsibility and encourages such arbitrary actions.

The discussion has proved to be very use-

ful first of all because it brought this Arakcheyev regime into the light of day and smashed it to smithereens.

But the usefulness of the discussion does not end there. It not only smashed the old regime in linguistics but also brought out the incredible confusion of ideas on cardinal questions of linguistics which prevails among the leading circles in this branch of science. Until the discussion began the "disciples" of N.Y. Marr kept silence and glossed over the unsatisfactory state of affairs in linguistics. But when the discussion started silence became impossible, and they were compelled to express their opinions in the press. And what did we find? It turned out that in N.Y. Marr's teachings there are a whole number of defects, errors, ill-defined problems and sketchy propositions. Why, one asks, have N.Y. Marr's "disciples" begun to talk about this only now, after the discussion opened? Why did they not see to it before? Why did they not speak about it in due time openly and honestly, as befits scientists?

Having admitted "some" errors of N.Y.Marr, his "disciples," it appears, think that Soviet linguistics can only be advanced on the basis of a "rectified" version of N.Y. Marr's theory, which they consider a Marxist one. No, save us from N.Y. Marr's "Marxism"! N.Y. Marr did indeed want to be, and endeavoured to be, a Marxist, but he failed to become one. He was nothing but a simplifier and vulgarizer of Marxism, similar to the "proletcultists" or the "Rappists."

N.Y. Marr introduced into linguistics the incorrect, non-Marxist formula that language is a superstructure, and got himself into a muddle and put linguistics into a muddle. Soviet linguistics cannot be advanced on the basis of an incorrect formula.

N.Y. Marr introduced into linguistics another and also incorrect and non-Marxist formula, regarding the "class character" of language, and got himself into a muddle and put linguistics into a muddle. Soviet linguistics cannot be advanced on the basis of an incorrect formula which is contrary to the whole course of the history of peoples and languages.

N.Y. Marr introduced into linguistics an immodest, boastful, arrogant tone alien to Marxism and tending towards a bald and off-hand negation of everything done in linguistics prior to N.Y. Marr.

N.Y. Marr shrilly abused the comparative-historical method as "idealistic." Yet it must be said that, despite its serious shortcomings, the comparative-historical method is nevertheless better than N.Y. Marr's really idealistic four-element analysis, because the former gives a stimulus to work, to a study of languages, while the latter only gives a stimulus to loll in one's armchair and tell fortunes in the tea-cup of the celebrated four elements.

N.Y. Marr haughtily discountenanced every attempt to study groups (families) of languages on the grounds that it was a manifestation of the "linguistic prototype" theory. Yet it cannot

be denied that the linguistic affinity of nations like the Slav nations, say, is beyond question, and that a study of the linguistic affinity of these nations might be of great value to linguistics in the study of the laws of language development. The "linguistic prototype" theory, I need hardly say, has nothing to do with it.

To listen to N.Y. Marr, and especially to his "disciples," one might think that prior to N.Y. Marr there was no such thing as the science of language, that the science of language appeared with the "new doctrine" of N.Y. Marr. Marx and Engels were much more modest: they held that their dialectical materialism was a product of the development of the sciences, including philosophy, in earlier periods.

Thus the discussion was useful also because it brought to light ideological shortcomings in Soviet linguistics.

I think that the sooner our linguistics rids itself of N.Y. Marr's errors, the sooner will it be possible to extricate it from its present crisis.

Elimination of the Arakcheyev regime in linguistics, rejection of N.Y. Marr's errors, and the introduction of Marxism into linguistics - that, in my opinion, is the way in which Soviet linguistics could be put on a sound basis.

Pravda, June 20, 1950.

CONCERNING CERTAIN PROBLEMS OF LINGUISTICS

Reply to Comrade E. Krasheninnikova.

Comrade Krasheninnikova,

I am answering your questions.

Q. Your article convincingly shows that language is neither the basis nor the superstructure. Would it be right to regard language as a phenomenon characteristic of both the basis and the superstructure, or would it be more correct to regard language as an intermediate phenomenon?

A. Of course, characteristic of language as a social phenomenon, is that common feature which is inherent in all social phenomena, including the basis and the superstructure, namely: it serves society just as society is served by all other social phenomena, including the basis and the superstructure. But this, properly speaking, exhausts that common feature which is inherent in all social phenomena. Beyond this, important distinctions begin between social phenomena.

The point is that social phenomena have, in addition to this common feature, their own specific features which distinguish them from each other and which are of primary importance for science. The specific features of the basis consist in that it serves society economically. The specific features of the superstructure consist in that it serves society by means of political, legal, aesthetic and other ideas and pro-

vides society with corresponding political, legal and other institutions. What then are the specific features of language, distinguishing it from other social phenomena? They consist in that language serves society as a means of intercourse between people, as a means for exchanging thoughts in society, as a means of enabling people to understand one another and to co-ordinate joint work in all spheres of human activity, both in the sphere of production and in the sphere of economic relations, both in the sphere of politics and in the sphere of culture, both in social life and in every-day life. These specific features are characteristic only of language, and precisely because they are characteristic only of language, language is the object of study by an independent science - linguistics. If there were no such specific features of language, linguistics would lose its right to independent existence.

In brief: language cannot be included either in the category of bases or in the category of superstructures.

Nor can it be included in the category of "intermediate" phenomena between the basis and the superstructure, for such "intermediate" phenomena do not exist.

But perhaps language could be included in the category of the productive forces of society, in the category, say, of instruments of production? Indeed, there does exist a certain analogy between languages and instruments of production: instruments of production manifest,

just as language does, a kind of indifference towards classes and can serve equally different classes of society, both old and new. Does this circumstance provide ground for including language in the category of instruments of production? No, it does not.

At one time, N.Y. Marr, seeing that his formula - "language is a superstructure on the basis" - encountered objections, decided to "reshape" it and announced that "language is an instrument of production." Was N.Y. Marr right in including language in the category of instruments of production? No, he certainly was not.

The point is that the similarity between language and instruments of production ends with the analogy I have just mentioned. But, on the other hand, there is a radical difference between language and instruments of production. This difference lies in the fact that whereas instruments of production produce material wealth, language produces nothing or "produces" words only. To put it more plainly, people possessing instruments of production can produce material wealth, but those very same people, if they possess a language but not instruments of production, cannot produce material wealth. It is not difficult to see that were language capable of producing material wealth, wind-bags would be the richest men on earth.

Q. Marx and Engels define language as "the immediate reality of thought," as "practical,...actual consciousness." "Ideas," Marx says, "do not exist divorced from language." In what

measure, in your opinion, should linguistics occupy itself with the semantic aspect of language, semantics, historical semasiology and stylistics, or should form alone be the subject of linguistics?

Semantics (semasiology) is one of the important branches of linguistics. The semantic aspect of words and expressions is of serious importance in the study of language. Hence, semantics (semasiology) must be assured its due place in linguistics.

However, in working on problems of semantics and in utilizing its data, its significance must in no way be over-estimated, and still less must it be abused. I have in mind certain philologists who, having an excessive passion for semantics, disregard language as "the immediate reality of thought" inseparably connected with thinking, divorce thinking from language and maintain that language is outliving its age and that it is possible to do without language.

Listen to what N.Y. Marr says:

"Language exists only inasmuch as it is expressed in sounds; the action of thinking occurs also without being expressed....Language (spoken) has already begun to surrender its functions to the latest inventions which are unreservedly conquering space, while thinking is on the up-grade, departing from its unutilized accumulations in the past and its new acquisitions, and is to oust and fully replace language. The language of the future is thinking which will be developing in technique free of natural matter. No language,

even the spoken language, which is all the same connected with the standards of nature, will be able to withstand it" (see "Selected Works" by N.Y. Marr).

If we interpret this "labour-magic" gibberish into simple human language, the conclusion may be drawn that:

a) N.Y. Marr divorces thinking from language;

b) N.Y. Marr considers that communication between people can be realized without language, with the help of thinking itself, which is free of the "natural matter" of language, free of the "standards of nature";

c) divorcing thinking from language and "having freed" it from the "natural matter" of language, N.Y. Marr lands into the swamp of idealism.

It is said that thoughts arise in the mind of man prior to their being expressed in speech, that they arise without linguistic material, without linguistic integument, in, so to say, a naked form. But that is absolutely wrong. Whatever thoughts arise in the human mind and at whatever moment, they can arise and exist only on the basis of the linguistic material, on the basis of language terms and phrases. Bare thoughts, free of the linguistic material, free of the "natural matter" of language, do not exist. "Language is the immediate reality of thought" (Marx). The reality of thought is manifested in language. Only idealists can speak of thinking not being connected with "the natur-

al matter" of language, of thinking without language.

In brief: over-estimation of semantics and abuse of it led N.Y. Marr to idealism.

Consequently, if semantics (semasiology) is safeguarded against exaggerations and abuses of the kind committed by N.Y. Marr and some of his "disciples," semantics can be of great benefit to linguistics.

Q. You quite justly say that the ideas, concepts, customs and moral principles of the bourgeoisie and those of the proletariat are directly antithetical. The class character of these phenomena is certainly reflected in the semantic aspect of language (and sometimes in its form - in the vocabulary - as is correctly pointed out in your article). In analyzing concrete linguistic material and, in the first place, the semantic aspect of language, can we speak of the class essence of the concepts expressed by languages, particularly in those cases when language expresses not only the thought of man but also his attitude towards reality, where his class affinity manifests itself with especial clarity?

A. Putting it more briefly, you want to know whether classes influence language, whether they introduce into language their specific words and expressions, whether there are cases when people attach a different meaning to one and the same word or expression depending on their class affinity?

Yes, classes influence language, introduce into the language their own specific words and

expressions and sometimes understand one and the same word or expression differently. There is no doubt about that.

However, it does not follow that specific words and expressions, as well as difference in semantics, can be of serious importance for the development of a single language common to the whole people, that they are capable of detracting from its significance or of changing its character.

Firstly, such specific words and expressions, as well as cases of difference in semantics, are so few in language that they hardly make up even one per cent of the entire linguistic material. Consequently, all the remaining overwhelming mass of words and expressions, as well as their semantics, are common to all classes of society.

Secondly, specific words and expressions with a class tinge are used in speech not according to rules of some sort of "class" grammar, which does not exist, but according to the grammatical rules of the existing language common to the whole people.

Hence, the existence of specific words and expressions and the facts of differences in the semantics of language do not refute, but, on the contrary, confirm the existence and necessity of a single language common to the whole people.

Q. In your article you quite correctly appraise Marr as a vulgarizer of Marxism. Does this mean that the linguists, including us, the young linguists, should reject the whole linguist-

ic heritage of Marr, who all the same has to his credit a number of valuable linguistic researches (Comrades Chikobava, Sanzheyev and others wrote about them during the discussion)? Approaching Marr critically, cannot we take from him what is useful and valuable?

A. Of course, the works of N.Y. Marr do not consist solely of errors. N.Y. Marr made very gross mistakes when he introduced into linguistics elements of Marxism in a distorted form, when he tried to create an independent theory of language. But N.Y. Marr has certain good and ably written works, in which he, forgetting his theoretical claims, conscientiously and, one must say, skilfully investigates individual languages. In these works one can find not a little that is valuable and instructive. Clearly, these valuable and instructive things should be taken from N.Y. Marr and utilized.

Q. Many linguists consider formalism one of the main causes of the stagnation in Soviet linguistics. We should very much like to know your opinion as to what formalism in linguistics consists in and how it should be overcome?

A. N.Y. Marr and his "disciples" accuse of "formalism" all linguists who do not accept the "new doctrine" of N.Y. Marr. This of course is not serious or clever.

N.Y. Marr considered that grammar is an empty "formality," and that people who regard the grammatical system as the foundation of language are formalists. This is altogether foolish.

I think that "formalism" was invented by

the authors of the "new doctrine" to facilitate their struggle against their opponents in linguistics.

The cause of the stagnation in Soviet linguistics is not the "formalism" invented by N.Y. Marr and his "disciples," but the Arakcheyev regime and the theoretical gaps in linguistics. The Arakcheyev regime was set up by the "disciples" of N.Y. Marr. Theoretical confusion was brought into linguistics by N.Y. Marr and his closest colleagues. To put an end to stagnation, both the one and the other must be eliminated. The removal of these plague spots will put Soviet linguistics on a sound basis, will lead it out on to the broad highway and enable Soviet linguistics to occupy first place in world linguistics.

June 29, 1950.
Pravda. July 4, 1950.

REPLY TO COMRADES

To Comrade Sanzheyev.

Dear Comrade Sanzheyev,

I am replying to your letter with considerable delay, for it was only yesterday forwarded to me from the apparatus of the Central Committee.

Your interpretation of my standpoint on the question of dialects is absolutely correct.

"Class" dialects, which it would be more correct to call jargons, do not serve the mass of the people, but a narrow social upper crust. Moreover, they do not have a grammatical system or basic word stock of their own. In view of this, they cannot possibly develop into independent languages.

Local ("territorial") dialects, on the other hand, serve the mass of the people and have a grammatical system and basic word stock of their own. In view of this, some local dialects, in the process of formation of nations, may become the basis of national languages and develop into independent national languages. This was the case, for instance, with the Kursk-Orel dialect (the Kursk-Orel "speech") of the Russian language, which formed the basis of the Russian national language. The same must be said of the Poltava-Kiev dialect of the Ukrainian language, which formed the basis of the Ukrainian national language. As for the other dialects of such languages, they lose their originality, merge with those languages and disappear in them.

Reverse processes also occur, when the single language of a nationality, which has not yet become a nation owing to the absence of the necessary economic conditions of development, collapses as a result of the disintegration of the state of that nationality, and the local dialects, which have not yet had time to be fully uniformized in the single language, revive and give rise to the formation of separate independent languages. Possibly, this was the case, for example, with the single Mongolian language.

July 11, 1950.
Pravda, August 2, 1950.

To Comrades D. Belkin and S. Furer.

I have received your letters.

Your mistake is that you have confused two different things and substituted another subject for that examined in my reply to Comrade Krasheninnikova.

1. In that reply I criticized N.Y. Marr who, dealing with language (spoken) and thought, divorces language from thought and thus lapses into idealism. Therefore, I referred in my reply to normal human beings possessing the faculty of speech. I maintained, moreover, that with such human beings thoughts can arise only on the basis of linguistic material, that bare thoughts unconnected with linguistic material do not exist among people who possess the faculty of speech.

Instead of accepting or rejecting this thesis, you introduce anomalous human beings, people without language, deaf-mutes, who have no language at their disposal and whose thoughts, of course, cannot arise on the basis of linguistic material. As you see, this is an entirely different subject which I did not touch upon and

could not have touched upon, since linguistics concerns itself with normal human beings possessing the faculty of speech and not with anomalous deaf-mutes who do not possess the faculty of speech.

You have substituted for the subject under discussion another subject that was not discussed.

2. From Comrade Belkin's letter it is evident that he places on a par the "language of words" (spoken language) and "gesture language" ("hand" language, according to N.Y. Marr). He seems to think that gesture language and the language of words are of equal significance, that at one time human society had no language of words, that "hand" language at that time played the part of the language of words which appeared later.

But if Comrade Belkin really thinks so, he is committing a serious error. Spoken language or the language of words has always been the sole language of human society capable of serving as an adequate means of intercourse between people. History does not know of a single human society, be it the most backward, that did not have its own spoken language. Ethnography does not know of a single backward tribe, be it as primitive or even more primitive than, say, the Australians or the Tierra del Fuegans of the last century, which did not have its own spoken language. In the history of mankind, spoken language has been one of the forces which helped human beings to emerge from

the animal world, unite into communities, develop their faculty of thinking, organize social production, wage a successful struggle against the forces of nature and attain the stage of progress we have today.

In this respect, the significance of the so-called gesture language, in view of its extreme poverty and limitations, is negligible. Properly speaking, this is not a language, and not even a linguistic substitute that could in one way or another replace spoken language, but an auxiliary means of extremely limited possibilities to which man sometimes resorts to emphasize this or that point in his speech. Gesture language spoken language are just as incomparable as are the primitive wooden hoe and the modern caterpillar tractor with its five furrow plough or tractor row drill.

3. Apparently, you are primarily interested in the deaf-mutes, and only secondarily in problems of linguistics. Evidently, it was precisely this circumstance that prompted you to put a number of questions to me. Well, if you insist, I am not averse to granting your request. How do matters stand with regard to deaf-mutes? Do they possess the faculty of thinking? Do thoughts arise with them? Yes, they possess the faculty of thinking and thoughts arise with them. Clearly, since deaf-mutes are deprived of the faculty of speech, their thoughts cannot arise on the basis of linguistic material. Can this be taken to mean that the thoughts of deaf-mutes are naked, are not connected with the "stand-

ards of nature" (N.Y. Marr's expression)? No, it cannot. The thoughts of deaf-mutes arise and can exist only on the basis of the images, sensations and conceptions they form in every-day life on the objects of the outside world and their relations among themselves, thanks to the senses of sight, of touch, taste and smell. Apart from these images, sensations and conceptions, thought is empty, is deprived of all content, that is, it does not exist.

July 22, 1950.
Pravda. August 2, 1950.

To Comrade A. Kholopov.

I have received your letter.

Pressure of work has somewhat delayed my reply.

Your letter tacitly proceeds from two premises: from the premise that it is permissible to quote the work of this or that author apart from the historical period of which the quotation treats, and secondly, from the premise that this or that conclusion or formula of Marxism, derived as a result of studying one of the periods of historical development, holds good for all periods of development and therefore must remain invariable.

I must say that both these premises are deeply mistaken.

A few examples.

1. In the forties of the past century when there was no monopoly capitalism as yet, when capitalism was developing more or less smoothly along an ascending line, spreading to new territories it had not yet occupied, and the law of uneven development could not yet fully operate, Marx and Engels concluded that a socialist revolution could not be victorious in one particular country, that it could be victorious only as a result of a joint blow in all, or in most, civilized countries. This conclusion subsequently became a guiding principle for all Marxists.

However, at the beginning of the twentieth century, especially in the period of the first world war, when it became clear to everyone that pre-monopoly capitalism had definitely developed into monopoly capitalism, when rising capitalism had become dying capitalism, when the war had revealed the incurable weaknesses of the world imperialist front, and the law of uneven development predetermined that the proletarian revolution would mature in different countries at different times, Lenin, proceeding from Marxist theory, came to the conclusion that in the new conditions of development, the socialist revolution could fully prove victorious in one country taken separately, that the simultaneous victory of the socialist revolution in all countries, or in a majority of civilized countries, was impossible owing to the uneven maturing of the revolution in those countries, that the old formula of Marx and Engels no longer

corresponded to the new historical conditions.

It is evident that here we have two different conclusions on the question of the victory of socialism, which not only contradict, but exclude each other.

Some dogmatists and talmudists who quote mechanically without delving into the essence of the matter, and apart from historical conditions, may say that one of these conclusions should be discarded as being absolutely incorrect, while the other conclusion, as the absolutely correct one, should be applied to all periods of development. Marxists, however, cannot but know that the dogmatists and talmudists are mistaken; they cannot but know that both of these conclusions are correct, though not absolutely, each being correct for its own time: Marx's and Engels' conclusion - for the period of pre-monopoly capitalism; and Lenin's conclusion - for the period of monopoly capitalism.

2. Engels in his "Anti-Dühring" said that after the victory of the socialist revolution, the state is bound to wither away. On these grounds, after the victory of the socialist revolution in our country, dogmatists and talmudists in our Party began demanding that the Party should take steps to ensure the speedy withering away of our state, to disband state organs, to give up a standing army.

However, the study of the world situation of our time led Soviet Marxists to the conclusion that in the conditions of capitalist encirclement, when the socialist revolution has

been victorious only in one country, and capitalism reigns in all other countries, the land of the victorious revolution should not weaken, but in every way strengthen its state, state organs, intelligence organs and army, if that land does not want to be crushed by the capitalist encirclement.. Russian Marxists came to the conclusion that Engels' formula has in view the victory of socialism in all, or in most, countries, that it cannot be applied in the case where socialism is victorious in one country taken separately and capitalism reigns in all the other countries.

Evidently, we have here two different formulas regarding the destiny of the socialist state, each formula excluding the other.

The dogmatists and talmudists may say that this circumstance creates an intolerable situation, that one of these formulas must be discarded as being absolutely erroneous, and the other - as the absolutely correct one - must be applied to all periods of development of the socialist state. Marxists, however, cannot but know that the dogmatists and talmudists are mistaken, for both these formulas are correct, though not absolutely, each being correct for its time: the formula of Soviet Marxists - for the period of the victory of socialism in one or several countries; and the formula of Engels - for the period when the consecutive victory of socialism in separate countries will lead to the victory of socialism in the majority of countries and when the necessary conditions will thus

have been created for the application of Engels' formula.

The number of such examples could be multiplied.

The same must be said of the two different formulas on the question of language, taken from various works of Stalin and cited by Comrade Kholopov in his letter.

Comrade Kholopov refers to Stalin's work "Concerning Marxism in Linguistics," where the conclusion is drawn that, as a result of the crossing, say, of two languages, one of them usually emerges victorious, while the other dies away, that, consequently, crossing does not produce some new third language, but preserves one of the languages. He refers further to another conclusion, taken from Stalin's report to the 16th Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.), where it is said that in the period of the victory of socialism on a world scale, when socialism is consolidated and becomes part of every-day life, national languages will inevitably merge into one common language which, of course, will be neither Great Russian nor German, but something new. Comparing these two formulas and seeing that, far from coinciding, they exclude each other, Comrade Kholopov falls into despair. "From your article," he writes in his letter, "I understood that the crossing of languages can never produce some new language, whereas prior to your article I was firmly convinced, in conformity with your speech at the 16th Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.), that under communism, languages

would merge into one common language."

Evidently, having discovered a contradiction between these two formulas and being deeply convinced that the contradiction must be removed, Comrade Kholopov considers it necessary to get rid of one of these formulas as incorrect and to clutch at the other as being correct for all periods and countries; but which formula to clutch at - he does not know. The result is something in the nature of a hopeless situation. Comrade Kholopov does not even suspect that both formulas can be correct - each for its own time.

That is always the case with dogmatists and talmudists who do not delve into the essence of the matter, quote mechanically and irrespective of the historical conditions of which the quotations treat, and invariably find themselves in a hopeless situation.

Yet if one examines the essence of the matter, there are no grounds for considering the situation hopeless. The fact is that Stalin's pamphlet "Concerning Marxism in Linguistics," and Stalin's speech at the 16th Party Congress, refer to two entirely different epochs, owing to which the formulas, too, prove to be different.

The formula given by Stalin in his pamphlet, in the part where it speaks of the crossing of languages, refers to the epoch prior to the victory of socialism on a world scale, when the exploiting classes are the dominant power in the world; when national and colonial oppression remains in force; when national isolation and mu-

tual distrust among nations are consolidated by differences between states; when, as yet, there is no national equality of rights; when the crossing of languages takes place as a struggle for the domination of one of the languages; when the conditions necessary for the peaceful and friendly co-operation of nations and languages are as yet lacking; when it is not the co-operation and mutual enrichment of languages that are on the order of the day, but the assimilation of some and the victory of other languages. It is clear that in such conditions there can only be victorious and defeated languages. It is precisely these conditions that Stalin's formula has in view when it says that the crossing, say, of two languages, results not in the formation of a new language, but in the victory of one of the languages and the defeat of the other.

As regards the other formula by Stalin, taken from his speech at the 16th Party Congress, in the part that touches on the merging of languages into one common language, it has in view another epoch, namely, the epoch after the victory of socialism on a world scale, when world imperialism no longer exists; when the exploiting classes are overthrown and national and colonial oppression is eradicated; when national isolation and mutual distrust among nations is replaced by mutual confidence and rapprochement between nations; when national equality has been put into practice; when the policy of oppressing and assimilating languages is abolished; when the co-operation of nations has been established, and it is possible for national languages freely to enrich one another through their co-operation. It is clear that in these conditions there can be no question of the suppression and defeat of some languages and the victory of others. Here we shall have not two languages, one of which is to suffer defeat, while the other is to emerge from the struggle victorious, but hundreds of national languages, out of which, as a result of a prolonged economic, political and cultural co-operation of nations, there will first appear most enriched unified zonal languages, and subsequently the zonal languages will merge into a single international language, which, of course, will be neither German, nor Russian, nor English, but a new language that has absorbed the best elements of the national and zonal languages.

Consequently, the two different formulas correspond to two different epochs in the development of society, and precisely because they correspond to them, both formulas are correct - each for its epoch.

To demand that these formulas should not be at variance with each other, that they should not exclude each other, is just as absurd as it would be to demand that the epoch of the domination of capitalism should not be at variance with the epoch of the domination of socialism, that socialism and capitalism should not exclude each other.

The dogmatists and talmudists regard Marx-

ism and separate conclusions and formulas of Marxism as a collection of dogmas, which "never" change, notwithstanding changes in the conditions of the development of society. They believe that if they learn these conclusions and formulas by heart and start citing them at random, they will be able to solve any problem, reckoning that the memorized conclusions and formulas will serve them for all times and countries, for all occasions in life. But this can be the conviction only of people who see the letter of Marxism, but not its essence, who learn by rote the texts of conclusions and formulas of Marxism, but do not understand their meaning.

Marxism is the science of the laws governing the development of nature and society, the science of the revolution of the oppressed and exploited masses, the science of the victory of socialism in all countries, the science of building communist society. As a science, Marxism cannot stand still, it develops and is perfected. In its development, Marxism cannot but be enriched by new experience, new knowledge - consequently, some of its formulas and conclusions cannot but change in the course of time, cannot but be replaced by new formulas and conclusions, corresponding to the new historical tasks. Marxism does not recognize invariable conclusions and formulas, obligatory for all epochs and periods. Marxism is the enemy of all dogmatism.

July 28, 1950.

Pravda. August 2, 1950.

(Foreign Languages Publishing Huuse, Moscow 1954)

ANSWERING LETTER TO THE INDIAN PRIME MINISTER, PANDIT JAWAHARLAC NEHRU

Concerning the peaceful settlement of the Korean question

15 July, 1950

To His Excellence, the Minister President of the Indian Republic, Mr. Pandit Jawaharlac Nehru.

I welcome your peace initiative. I fully share your opinion on the question of the suitability of a friendly settlement of the Korean question through the Security Council, with the unconditional participation of the representatives of the five great powers and including the People's Government of China. Further, for a quick settlement of the Korean question, it would be appropriate for a representative of the Korean people to be present at the Security Council.

Yours faithfully,
J. STALIN
Minister President of the Soviet Union.

("New Germany," No. 165, July 1950)

TELEGRAM TO THE MINISTER PRESIDENT OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF POLAND JOSEF CYRANKIEWICZ

On the occasion of the Polish National Holiday

22 July, 1950

On the occasion of the national holiday, - the anniversary of the rebirth of the Polish Republic, - please accept, Mr. Minister, my sincere greetings to the Polish people, to the government of the Polish Republic and to you personally.

The Soviet people wish the fraternal Polish people further success in their efforts to build a democratic people's Poland.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 169, 23 July, 1950)

GREETINGS MESSAGE TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CENTRAL PEOPLE'S GOVERNMENT OF THE CHINESE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC MAO TSE TUNG

On the occasion of the twenty-third anniversary of the People's Liberation Army of the People's Republic of China

1 August, 1950

Please accept my sincere greetings and best wishes on the occasion of the twenty-third anniversary of the People's Liberation Army of the People's Republic of China.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 178, 1 August, 1950)

GREETINGS TELEGRAM TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE BULGARIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC WYLKO TSHERVENKOV

On the occasion of his 50th Birthday

6 September, 1950

I congratulate you wholeheartedly on your 50th birthday. I send you my best wishes for good health and wish you strength for your fruitful work for the well-being of the Bulgarian people and the fraternal alliance between our countries.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 208, 6 September, 1950)

TELEGRAM TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CENTRAL PEOPLE'S GOVERNMENT OF THE CHINESE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC MAO TSE TUNG

On the occasion of the first anniversary of the foundation of the People's Republic of China

1 October, 1950

To the Chairman of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, Mr. Mao Tse Tung.

On the occasion of the first anniversary of the foundation of the People's Republic of China, please accept, Mr. Chairman, my fraternal greetings. I wish the great Chinese people, and

you personally, further success in the building of an independent people's democratic China.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," No. 230, 1 October, 1950)

TELEGRAM TO THE MINISTER PRESIDENT OF THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OTTO GROTEWOHL

On the occasion of the first anniversary of the foundation of the German Democratic Republic

7 October, 1950

To the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic, Mr. Otto Grotewohl.

Please accept, Mr. Minister President, on the occasion of the national holiday, - Republic Day, - my sincere good wishes for the German people, for the government of the Republic and for you personally; and my wishes for success in the building of an united, independent, democratic, peace-loving Germany.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 235, 7 October, 1950)

TELEGRAM TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CABINET OF MINISTERS OF THE KOREAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC, KIM IR SEN

On the occasion of the second anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the U.S.S.R. and the Korean People's Democratic Republic

"Pravda," 12 October, 1950

To the Chairman of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Korean People's Democratic Republic, Mr. Kim Ir Sen.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your expression of friendly feelings and good wishes on the second anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the People's Republic of Korea and the U.S.S.R.

I wish the Korean people, heroic defenders of the independence of their country, a successful termination of their years long fight for the creation of an united, independent, democratic Korea.

J. STALIN

("Pravda," 12 October, 1950)

TELEGRAM OF THANKS TO THE MINISTER PRESIDENT OF THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC, OTTO GROTEWOHL

On the occasion of the thirty-third anniversary of the Great Socialist October Revolution

November 1950

To the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic, Mr. Otto Grotewohl.

Please accept, Mr. Minister President, my thanks for your congratulations and good wishes on the occasion of the thirty-third anniversary of the Great Socialist October Revolution.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," No. 272, 19 November, 1950)

GREETINGS TELEGRAM TO THE MINISTER PRESIDENT AND GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA ARMY-GENERAL ENVER HOXHA

On the occasion of the sixth anniversary of the liberation of Albania from the fascist occupation

November 1950

On the occasion of the national celebration of the sixth anniversary of the liberation of

Albania from the fascist occupation, I wish you, the Albanian government and the Albanian people further success in the building of the new, people's democratic Albania.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," No. 280, 30 November, 1950)

TELEGRAM OF THANKS TO THE MINISTER PRESIDENT OF THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC, OTTO GROTEWOHL

January 1951

To the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic, Mr. Otto Grotewohl.

I ask the government of the German Democratic Republic and you personally, Comrade Minister President, to accept my thanks for the congratulations and friendly good wishes on the occasion of my birthday.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 1, 3 January, 1951)

TELEGRAM TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CENTRAL PEOPLE'S GOVERNMENT OF THE CHINESE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC, MAO TSE TUNG

On the occasion of the first anniversary of the signing of the Soviet-Chinese Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Support

"Pravda," 14 February, 1951

To the Chairman of the Central People's Government of the Chinese People's Republic, Comrade Mao Tse Tung.

Please accept, Comrade Chairman, my sincere good wishes on the occasion of the first anniversary of the signing of the Soviet-Chinese Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Support.

I do not doubt that our treaty, and the friendly alliance of the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union, will continue in the future to strengthen the peace of the entire world.

J. STALIN

("Pravda," 14 February, 1951)

INTERVIEW WITH A "PRAVDA" CORRESONDENT

17 February, 1951

Q. How do you evaluate the last declaration of the British Prime Minister Attlee, in the House of Commons, that since the end of the war, the Soviet Union has not disarmed; that is, they have not demobilized their troops; that the Soviet Union has since then even further increased their forces?

A. I evaluate this declaration of Prime Minister Attlee as a slander on the Soviet Union.

The whole world knows that the Soviet Union has demobilized its troops after the war. As it is known, the demobilization was carried out in three phases: the first and second phases in the year 1945, and the third phase from May to September, 1946. In addition, in the years 1946 and 1947, the demobilization of older age groups of the Soviet army was carried through and, starting in 1948, the rest of the older age groups were demobilized.

That is a generally known fact.

If Prime Minister Attlee was conversant with finance and economy he would be able to understand, without difficulty, that no one state, also not the Soviet Union, is in the position to completely develop the volume of their peace industry, - even more, - dozens of billions of the state expenditure is required for the purpose of building, such as the hydro-power works on the Volga, Dnieper and Amu-Darya; to introduce

the policy of a systematic reduction in the price of consumer goods. Likewise, dozens of billions of the state expenditure is needed to immediately add to the hundreds of billions for the reconstruction of the economy demolished by the German occupation, to expand the people's economy and at the same time to increase their military forces and develop their war industry. It is not difficult to understand that such a foolish policy would lead to state bankruptcy. Prime Minister Attlee must, from his own experience as well as from the experience of the U.S.A., know that the increasing of the military forces of countries and the development the arms race would lead to a limitation of peace industry, to a close-down of great building, to a raising of tax and to a raising of the price of consumer goods. It is understandable that, if the Soviet Union does not limit the peace industry but, on the contrary, furthers it, then new building, greater hydropower works and water systems will not be suspended but, on the contrary, developed, the policy of reducing prices will not be suspended but, on the contrary, continued, they could not at the same time develop their war industry and increase their military strength without thereby taking the risk of bankruptcy.

And if Prime Minister Attlee, despite all these facts and economic considerations, nevertheless holds it possible to openly insult the Soviet Union and its peaceful politics, one can only declare that, by slandering the Soviet Union,

the present Labour government in England wants to justify carrying on their own arms race.

Prime Minister Attlee needs to lie about the Soviet Union; he must represent the peaceful politics of the Soviet Union as aggressive, and the aggressive politics of the English government as peaceful politics to mislead the English people, to blindfold them with this lie about the Soviet Union, and in this way drag them towards a new world war that would be organized by the warmongering circles in the United States of America.

Prime Minister Attlee pretends to be a follower of peace. But if he really is for peace, why was he against the proposal of the Soviet Union in the United Nations Organization on the conclusion of a peace pact between the Soviet Union, England, the United States of America, China and France?

If he really is for peace, why is he against the proposals of the Soviet Union to immediately begin to limit armaments and to immediately forbid atomic weapons?

If he really is for peace, why does he persecute those that intercede for the defence of peace; why has he forbidden the peace congress in England? Could the campaign for the defence of peace possibly threaten the security of England?

It is clear that Prime Minister Attlee is not for the keeping of peace, but rather for the unleashing of a new world-encompassing war of aggression.

Q. What do you think about the intervention in Korea? How can that end?

A. If England and the United States of America finally decline the proposals of the People's Government of China for peace, then the war in Korea can only end in defeat of the interventionists.

Q. Why? Are then, the American and English generals and officers worse than the Chinese and Korean?

A. No, not worse. The American and English generals and officers are not worse than the generals and officers of any other country you like to name. Where the soldiers of the U.S.A. and England are concerned, in the war against Hitler-Germany and militaristic Japan, they proved to be the best side, as is known. Where, then, lies the difference? In that the soldiers in the war against Korea and China do not consider it as just, whereas in the war against Hitler-Germany and militaristic Japan, they considered it absolutely just. It also lies in that this war is extremely unpopular among the American and English soldiers.

In this case it is difficult to convince the soldiers that China, who threatened neither England nor America, from whom the Americans stole the island of Taiwan, are aggressors, and that the U.S.A., having stolen the island of Taiwan and led their troops straight to the borders of China, is the defending side. It is therefore difficult to convince the troops that the U.S.A. is right to defend its security on Korean terri-

tory and on the borders of China, and that China and Korea are not right to defend their security on their own territory or on the borders of their states. That is why the war is unpopular among the American and English soldiers.

It is understandable that experienced generals and officers will suffer a defeat if their soldiers are forced into a war which they consider totally unjust, and if they believe their duties at the front to be formal, without believing in the justice of their mission, without feeling enthusiasm.

Q. How do you evaluate the decision of the United Nations Organization to declare the Chinese People's Republic as the aggressors?

A. I regard it as a scandalous decision.

Really, one must have lost what was left of conscience to maintain that the United States of America, which has stolen Chinese territory, the island of Taiwan, and fallen upon China's borders in Korea, is the defensive side; and on the other hand, to declare that the Chinese People's Republic which has defended its borders and striven to take back the island of Taiwan, stolen by the Americans, is the aggressor.

The United Nations Organization, which was created as a bulwark for keeping peace, has been transformed into an instrument of war, a means to unleash a new world war. The aggressive core of the United Nations Organization have formed the aggressive North Atlantic pact from ten member states (the U.S.A., England,

France, Belgium, Canada, Holland, Luxemburg, Denmark, Norway, Iceland) and twenty Latin-American countries (Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Chile, Columbia, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Equador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruquay, Venezuela.) And the representatives of these countries now make the decisions in the United Nations Organization about war and peace. It was these that have, in the United Nations Organizations, carried through the scandalous decision about the aggression of the Chinese People's Republic.

It is typical of the present situation in the United Nations Organization, that, for example, the little Dominican Republic in America that has a population figure of scarcely two million, has today the same weight in the United Nations Organization as India has, and a much greater weight than the Chinese People's Republic, which has been robbed of a voice in the United Nations Organization.

Thus, the United Nations Organization, from being a world organization of nations with equal rights, has changed into an instrument of a war of aggression. In reality, the United Nations Organization is now not so much a world organization as an organization for the Americans and treats American aggression as acceptable. Not only the United States of America and Canada are striving to unleash a new war, but on this path you also find the twenty Latin-American countries; their landowners and merchants long for a new war somewhere in Europe or Asia, to sell their goods to the countries at inflated prices, and to make millions out of this bloody business. The fact is not a secret to anybody that the representatives of the twenty Latin-American countries represent the strongest supporters and the willing army of the United States of America in the United Nations Organization.

The United Nations Organization treads, in this manner, the inglorious path of the League of Nations. Thereby they bury their moral authority and fall into decay.

Q. Do you hold a new world war to be unavoidable?

A. No. At least, one can, at present, hold it to be not unavoidable.

Of course, in the United States of America, in England and also in France, there are aggressive powers that long for a new war. They need war to achieve super-profits and to plunder other countries. These are the billionaires and millionaires that regard war as a fountain of revenue, that brings colossal profits.

They, the aggressive powers, hold the reactionary governments in their hands and guide them. But at the same time they are afraid of their people who do not want a new war and are for the keeping of peace. Therefore they take the trouble of using the reactionary governments to ensnare their people with lies, to deceive them, to represent a new war as a war of defence, and the peaceful politics of peace-

loving countries as aggressive. They take the trouble to deceive the people, to force them and draw them into a new war with their aggressive plans.

They therefore even fear the campaign for the defence of peace, they fear that this campaign would expose the aggressive intentions of the reactionary governments.

They therefore even oppose the proposals of the Soviet Union on the conclusion of a peace treaty, on the limitation of armaments and on the forbidding of atomic weapons; they fear that the acceptance of these proposals would frustrate the aggressive measures of the reactionary governments and render the arms race unnecessary.

Where will all this struggle between the aggressive and the peace-loving powers end?

Peace will be kept and strengthened if the people take the holding of peace into their own hands and defend it to the utmost. War could be unavoidable if the arsonists of war succeed in trapping the masses with their lies, in deceiving them and in drawing them into a new war.

Now, therefore, a broad campaign for the holding of peace, as a way of exposing the criminal machinations of the arsonists of war, is of prime importance.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it will continue to carry through the politics of preventing war and keeping peace.

("For lasting Peace, for People's Democracy!" No. 8, 23 February - 1 March, 1951)

TELEGRAM TO THE MINISTER PRESIDENT OF THE HUNGARIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC ISTVAN DOBI

On the occasion of the third anniversary of the signing of the Soviet-Hungarian Treaty of Friendship and Support

February 1951

Please accept, Mr. Minister President, my greetings and best wishes on the occasion of the third anniversary of the signing of the Soviet-Hungarian Treaty of Friendship and Support.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," No. 44, 21 February, 1951)

GREETINGS TELEGRAM TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF BULGARIA WYLKO TSHERVENKOV

March 1951

Please accept my good wishes on the occasion of the third anniversary of the signing of the Friendship and Support Treaty between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of Bulgaria.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," Vol. 2, No. 67, 20 March, 1951)

GREETINGS AND GOOD WISHES TELEGRAM TO THE KIROV-WORKS COLLECTIVE

On the occasion of the 150th Jubilee of the Kirov-Works and on its award of the Order of Lenin

"Pravda," 3 April, 1951

To the Director of the Works, Comrade Smirnov,

To the Chief Engineer of the Works, Comrade Sacharyin,

To the Party Organizer of the C.C., C.P.S.U.(B.), Comrade Smirnov,

To the Chairman of the Management Committee, Comrade Bogdanov,

To the Comsomol Organizer of the C.C. of the Comsomol, Comrade Korssakov.

I congratulate and greet the Collective of men and women workers, engineers, technicians and employees on the 150th Jubilee of the Kirov-Works, formerly the Putilov-Works, and on its award of the Order of Lenin.

As one of the oldest factories in the country, the Kirov-Works has played an historic role in the revolutionary struggle of the Russian working class to build Soviet power and in the strengthening of the economy and the defence of our Motherland.

After the Great Patriotic War, the Collective has achieved great successes in the reconstruction of the Works and the resumption of production for the economy.

I wish you, Comrades Kirov-workers, further success in your work and in the fulfilment of the task entrusted to you by the Party and the government.

J. STALIN

("Pravda," 3 April, 1951)

GREETINGS TELEGRAM TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE HUNGARIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC ISTVAN DOBI

On the occasion of the sixth anniversary of the liberation of Hungary by the Soviet army

April 1951

On the occasion of the national day of celebration of the Hungarian People's Republic, please accept my greetings and best wishes for the further success of the Hungarian people.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," No. 80, 7 April, 1951)

GREETINGS TELEGRAM TO THE MINISTER PRESIDENT OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF POLAND, JOSEF CYRANKIEWICZ

On the occasion of the sixth anniversary of the signing of the Soviet-Polish Treaty of Friendship and Support

April 1951

Please accept my sincere congratulations and best wishes on the sixth anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Friendship and Support between the Soviet Union and the Republic of Poland.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," Vol. 2, No. 95, 24 April, 1951)

GREETINGS TELEGRAM TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE CZECHOSLOVAKIAN REPUBLIC ANTONIN ZAPOTOCKY

On the occasion of the sixth anniversary of the liberation of Czechoslovakia from the fascist occupation

May 1951

Please accept my congratulations to the Czechoslovakian government and to you personally on the occasion of the sixth anniversary of the liberation of Czechoslovakia from the fas-

cist occupation, and also my wishes for the further success in the political, economic and cultural building of the Czechoslovakian Republic.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 105, 10 May, 1951)

TELEGRAM TO THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE MINISTER PRESIDENT OF THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC WALTER ULBRICHT

On the occasion of the sixth anniversary of the liberation of Germany from the fascist yoke

17 May, 1951

To the Representative of the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic, Comrade Walter Ulbricht.

I sincerely thank the government of the German Democratic Republic, and you personally, for the friendly letter on the occasion of the sixth anniversary of the liberation of Germany from the fascist yoke. I wish the German people and the government of the German Democratic Republic further success in uniting the democratic forces of Germany and in the securing of peace.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 111, 18 May, 1951)

TELEGRAM TO THE STATE PRESIDENT OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF POLAND BOLESLAW BIERUT

On the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the liberation of Poland

July 1951

Please accept, Comrade President, the sincere greetings and best wishes of the Praesidium of the U.S.S.R., and myself, on the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the liberation of Poland.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," Vol. 2, No. 169, 24 July, 1951)

TELEGRAM TO THE MINISTER PRESIDENT OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF POLAND JOSEF CYRANKIEWICZ

On the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the liberation of Poland

July 1951

Please accept, Comrade Minister President, the occasion of the national day of celeb- on of the Polish Republic, my friendly greet- ings to the Polish people, to the government of

the Republic of Poland and to you personally, and also my wishes for new success in the further development of the democratic people's Poland.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," Vol. 2, No. 169, 24 July, 1951)

TELEGRAM TO THE MINISTER PRESIDENT OF THE RUMANIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC PETRU GROZA

On the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the liberation of Rumania

August 1951

On the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the liberation of Rumania, the government of the U.S.S.R. and I myself, congratulate the government of the Rumanian People's Republic and wish further success to the Rumanian people.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 195, 24 August, 1951)

ANSWERING TELEGRAM TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CENTRAL PEOPLE'S GOVERNMENT OF THE CHINESE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC MAO TSE TUNG

On the occasion of the sixth anniversary of victory over the Japanese imperialists

2 September, 1951

To the Chairman of the Central People's Government of the Chinese People's Republic, Comrade Mao Tse Tung.

I thank you, Comrade Chairman, for the high estimation of the role which the Soviet Union and its fighting power played in the smashing of Japanese aggression.

The Chinese people and their liberation army have played a great role, despite the machinations of the Kuomintang, in the liquidation of Japanese imperialism. The struggle of the Chinese people and their liberation army has helped the smashing of the Japanese aggression profoundly.

It cannot be doubted that the unbreakable friendship of the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic serves and will serve to guarantee peace in the far East against all and every aggressor and arsonist of war.

Please accept, Comrade Chairman, the good wishes of the Soviet Union and its fighting forces on the sixth anniversary of the liberation of East Asia from the yoke of Japanese imperialism.

Long live the great friendship of the Chinese People's Republic and the Soviet Union!

Long live the Chinese People's Liberation Army!

J. STALIN
Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R.

("New Times," No. 36, 5 September, 1951. P. 1)

TELEGRAM TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CENTRAL PEOPLE'S GOVERNMENT OF THE CHINESE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC MAO TSE TUNG

On the occasion of the second anniversary of the founding of the Chinese People's Republic

1 October, 1951

To the Chairman of the Central People's Government of the Chinese People's Republic, Comrade Mao Tse Tung.

On the second anniversary of the proclamation of the Chinese People's Republic, please accept, Comrade Chairman, my friendly congratulations.

I send the great Chinese people, the government of the Chinese People's Republic and you personally, my sincere wishes for further success in the building o[illegible]ople's democratic China.

I would like to see [illegible]ther strengthening of the great friendship [illegible]een the Chinese People's Republic and the Soviet Union as a safe guarantee of peace and security in the far East.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," Vol. 2, No. 229, 2 October 1951)

ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS OF A "PRAVDA" CORRESPONDENT

On the Atomic weapon

"Pravda," 6 October, 1951

Q. What do you think of the clamour in the foreign press these days in connection with an Atom bomb test in the Soviet Union?

A. As a matter of fact, we have carried out a test of a certain kind of Atom bomb. Tests with Atom bombs of different calibres will also continue, in accordance with the plans for the defence of our country against an attack carried out by the Anglo-American aggressive bloc.

Q. In connection with the Atom bomb test, various well-known personalities in the U.S.A. pretend to be alarmed and shout that the security of the U.S.A. is threatened. Is there any ground for such excitement?

A. There is no ground whatsoever for such excitement.

These well-known personalities in the U.S.A. cannot be unaware that the Soviet Union is not only against the application of Atomic weapons, but also for their forbidding, for the cessation of their production. As it is known, the Soviet Union has repeatedly demanded the forbidding of Atomic weapons, but each time they were refused by the powers of the Atlantic bloc. That signifies that in the case of an attack by the U.S.A. on our country, the ruling circles of the U.S.A. would use the Atom bomb. This circumstance has forced the Soviet Union to also own Atomic weapons to meet the aggressors well armed.

Of course, it would please the aggressors if the Soviet Union was unarmed in the case of them undertaking an attack. But the Soviet Union is not in agreement with that, and believes that one must meet the aggressor well armed.

Consequently, if the U.S.A. does not have the intention of attacking the Soviet Union, one must hold the excitement of well-known personalities of the U.S.A. as purposeless howling, as the Soviet Union is not thinking of attacking, at any time, the U.S.A. or any other country.

Well-known personalities of the U.S.A. are dissatisified that not only the U.S.A., but also other countries and, above all, the Soviet Union, possess the secret of Atomic weapons. They would rather that the U.S.A. had the monopoly on Atom bomb production, that the U.S.A. had unlimited possibilities to frighten and blackmail other countries. What grounds do they have for really thinking so, what right do they have? Do the interests of safeguarding peace demand such a monopoly, perhaps? Would it not be more correct to say that it is exactly the opposite case, that the safeguarding of peace demands, above all, the liquidation of such monopolies and the unconditional forbidding of Atomic weapons? I think that the adherents of the Atom bomb would only agree to forbid Atomic weapons in the case of them seeing that they do not have the monopoly any more.

Q. What do you think of international control of the supply of Atomic weapons?

A. The Soviet Union is for the forbidding of Atomic weapons and for the suspension of the production of Atomic weapons. The Soviet Union is for the establishment of international control, for a decision on the forbidding of Atomic weapons, on the suspension of production of Atomic weapons and on the use of already manufactured Atom bombs for civilian purposes exclusively and conscientiously. The Soviet Union for such an international control.

Well-known American personalities likewise speak of "control," but their "control" is based

not on the suspension of the production of Atomic weapons, but rather on the continuation of such production and, this to such an extent that corresponds to the available sources of raw materials available to this or that country. Consequently, the American "control" is not for the forbidding of Atomic weapons, but rather for their legalization and sanctioning. That would sanction the right of the arsonists of war, with the help of Atómic weapons, to annihilate tens of thousands, no, - hundreds of thousands of peaceful people. It is not difficult to understand that this is not control, but rather a mockery of control, a deception of the peace-desiring people. Of course, such a "control" will not satisfy the peace-loving people, who demand the forbidding of Atomic weapons and the suspension of their production.

("Unity," 18 October, 1951, P. 1313)

TELEGRAM TO THE MINISTER PRESIDENT OF THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OTTO GROTEWOHL

On the occasion of the second anniversary of the foundation of the German Democratic Republic

7 October, 1951

To the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic, Comrade Otto Grotewohl.

On the national day of celebration - the

second anniversary of the foundation of the German Democratic Republic - please accept, Comrade Minister President, my congratulations. I wish the German people, the government and you personally, further success in the building of an united, independent, democratic, peace-loving German state.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," Vol. 2, No. 234, 7 October, 1951)

ANSWERING TELEGRAM TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CABINET OF MINISTERS OF THE KOREAN PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC KIM IR SEN

On the occasion of the third anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic and economic relations between the U.S.S.R. and the Korean People's Democratic Republic

"Pravda," 20 October, 1951

Comrade Chairman, in the name of the government of the Soviet Union and myself, please accept our thanks for your greetings and good wishes on the occasion of the third anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between our countries.

I wish the brave Korean people success in their heroic struggle for the freedom and independence of their homeland.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," Vol. 2, No. 246, 21 October, 1951)

TELEGRAM TO THE MINISTER PRESIDENT OF THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OTTO GROTEWOHL

On the occasion of the thirty-fourth anniversary of the Great Socialist October Revolution

November 1951

To the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic, Comrade Otto Grotewohl.

Please accept, Comrade Minister President, the thanks of the Soviet government and myself for your congratulations and good wishes on the thirty-fourth anniversary of the Great Socialist October Revolution.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 270, 20 November, 1951)

GREETINGS TELEGRAM TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE CZECHOSLOVAKIAN REPUBLIC KLEMENT GOTTWALD

On the occasion of his 55th Birthday

23 November, 1951

Dear Comrade Gottwald,

I send you sincere congratulations on your birthday and wish you success in your work for the well-being of the fraternal Czechoslovakian people.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," Vol. 2, No. 275, 25 November, 1951)

NEW YEAR MESSAGE TO THE JAPANESE PEOPLE

31 December, 1951

To the Chief Editor of the Kyodo Agency, Mr. Kiishi Iwamoto.

Dear Mr. Iwamoto! I have received your request to send the Japanese people a message for New Year.

It is not a tradition of Soviet statesmen to send greetings to the people of another state. But the great sympathy that the people of the Soviet Union have for the Japanese people, who have suffered misery through foreign

occupation, leads me to make an exception to the rule and to accede to your request.

I ask you to convey to the Japanese people my wishes for their freedom and happiness, as well as success in their courageous struggle for the independence of their homeland.

The people of the Soviet Union have in the past, learnt to know themselves, the terror of foreign occupation, in which the Japanese imperialists took part. Therefore, they fully understand the sorrow of the Japanese people, have great sympathy for them and believe that the rebirth and independence of their homeland will be achieved, even as it was by the people of the Soviet Union.

I wish the Japanese workers liberation from unemployment, from poor wages, the abolition of high prices for consumer goods and success in the struggle for keeping peace.

I wish the Japanese peasants liberation from landlessness and poverty, the abolition of high taxes and success in the struggle for keeping peace.

I wish the entire Japanese people and their intelligentsia, complete victory of the democratic forces of Japan, the revival and prosperity of the economic life of the country, a blossoming of national culture, knowledge and art as well as success in the struggle for keeping peace.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 2, 3 January, 1952)

TELEGRAM OF THANKS TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIALIST UNITY PARTY OF GERMANY

"New Germany," 3 January, 1952

To the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, Wilhelm Pieck, Otto Grotewohl, Walter Ulbricht.

I thank you and, through you, the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, for your congratulations and good wishes.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 2, 3 January, 1952)

TELEGRAM OF THANKS TO THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE MINISTER PRESIDENT OF THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC WALTER ULBRICHT

"New Germany," 3 January, 1952

To the Representative of the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic, Comrade Walter Ulbricht.

I thank you, Comrade Deputy of the Minister President, for your congratulations on my birthday.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 2, 3 January, 1952)

TELEGRAM OF THANKS TO THE PARTY DIRECTOR OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GERMANY

January 1952

To the Party Director of the Communist Party of Germany, Max Reimann.

I sincerely thank you and, through you, the Party Directorate of the Communist Party of Germany, for your congratulations and good wishes.

J. STALIN

("Socialist People's Newspaper," 7 January, 1952)

TELEGRAM TO THE WORKERS OF THE MAGNITORSKER STEELWORKS COMBINE

On the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the opening of the Combine

"Pravda," 31 January, 1952

To the Magnitorsker Steelworks Combine.

To the Director of the Combine, Comrade Borissov.

To the Chief Engineer of the Combine, Comrade Voronov.

To the Party Organizer of the C.C., C.P.-S.U.(B.), Comrade Svetlov.

To the Chairman of the Trade Union, Comrade Pliskanos.

To the Comsomol Organizer of the C.C. of the Comsomol, Comrade Pankov.

I greet and congratulate the men and women workers, engineers, technicians and employees of the Magnitorsker Steelworks Combine and the "Magnitostroj" Trust on the twentieth anniversary of the opening of the Combine, the mighty metallurgic basis of the country.

The steel workers of Magnitorsk have, as upright sons and daughters of our Motherland, throughout the years, honestly and devotedly worked for the development of the production capacity of the Combine, successfully applied the new technology, continued the unbroken production of metal and honourably fulfilled the task set by the Party and the government to supply our country with metal.

I wholeheartedly wish you, Comrades, new success in your work.

J. STALIN

("Pravda," 31 January, 1952)

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF SOCIALISM IN THE U.S.S.R.

To the Participants in the Economic Discussion

REMARKS ON ECONOMIC QUESTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE NOVEMBER 1951 DISCUSSION

I have received all the materials on the economic discussion arranged to assess the draft textbook on political economy. The material received includes the "Proposals for the Improvement of the Draft Textbook on Political Economy," "Proposals for the Elimination of Mistakes and Inaccuracies" in the draft, and the "Memorandum on Disputed Issues."

On all these materials, as well as on the draft textbook, I consider it necessary to make the following remarks.

1. CHARACTER OF ECONOMIC LAWS UNDER SOCIALISM

Some comrades deny the objective character of laws of science, and of the laws of political economy particularly, under socialism. They deny that the laws of political economy reflect law-governed processes which operate independently of the will of man. They believe that in view of the specific role assigned to the Soviet state by history, the Soviet state and its leaders can abolish existing laws of political ec-

onomy and can "form," "create," new laws.

These comrades are profoundly mistaken. It is evident that they confuse laws of science, which reflect objective processes in nature or society, processes which take place independently of the will of man, with the laws which are issued by governments, which are made by the will of man, and which have only juridical validity. But they must not be confused.

Marxism regards laws of science - whether they be laws of natural science or laws of political economy - as the reflection of objective processes which take place independently of the will of man. Man may discover these laws, get to know them, study them, reckon with them in his activities and utilize them in the interests of society, but he cannot change or abolish them. Still less can he form or create new laws of science.

Does this mean, for instance, that the results of the action of the laws of nature, the results of the action of the forces of nature, are generally inavertible, that the destructive action of the forces of nature always and everywhere proceeds with an elemental and inexorable power that does not yield to the influence of man? No, it does not. Leaving aside astronomical, geological and other similar processes, which, even if he has come to know the laws of their development, man really is powerless to influence, in many other cases man is very far from powerless, in the sense of being able to influence the processes of nature. In all such

cases, having come to know the laws of nature, reckoning with them and relying on them, and intelligently applying and utilizing them, man can restrict their sphere of action, and can impart a different direction to the destructive forces of nature and convert tham to the use of society.

To take one of numerous examples. In olden times the overflow of big rivers, flood, and the resulting destruction of homes and crops, was considered an inavertible calamity, against which man was powerless. But with the lapse of time and the development of human knowledge, when man had learned to build dams and hydropower stations, it became possible to protect society from the calamity of flood which had formerly seemed to be inavertible. More, man learned to curb the destructive forces of nature, to harness them, so to speak, to convert the force of water to the use of society and to utilize it for the irrigation of fields and the generation of power.

Does this mean that man has thereby abolished laws of nature, laws of science, and has created new laws of nature, new laws of science? No, it does not. The fact is that all this procedure of averting the action of the destructive forces of water and of utilizing them in the interests of society takes place without any violation, alteration or abolition of scientific laws or the creation of new scientific laws. On the contrary, all this procedure is effected in precise conformity with the laws of nature and the

laws of science, since any violation, even the slightest, of the laws of nature would only upset matters and render the procedure futile.

The same must be said of the laws of economic development, the laws of political economy - whether in the period of capitalism or in the period of socialism. Here, too, the laws of economic development, as in the case of natural science, are objective laws, reflecting processes of economic development which take place independently of the will of man. Man may discover these laws, get to know them and relying upon them, utilize them in the interests of society, impart a different direction to the destructive action of some of the laws, restrict their sphere of action, and allow fuller scope to other laws that are forcing their way to the forefront; but he cannot destroy them or create new economic laws.

One of the distinguishing features of political economy is that its laws, unlike those of natural science, are impermanent, that they, or at least the majority of them, operate for a definite historical period, after which they give way to new laws. However, these laws are not abolished, but lose their validity owing to the new economic conditions and depart from the scene in order to give place to new laws, laws which are not created by the will of man, but which arise from the new economic conditions.

Reference is made to Engels' "Anti-Dühring," to his formula which says that, with the abolition of capitalism and the socialization

of the means of production, man will obtain control of his means of production, that he will be set free from the yoke of social and economic relations and become the "master" of his social life. Engels calls this freedom "appreciation of necessity." And what can this "appreciation of necessity" mean? It means that, having come to know objective laws ("necessity"), man will apply them with full consciousness in the interests of society. That is why Engels says in the same book:

"The laws of his own social activity, which have hitherto confronted him as extraneous laws of nature dominating him, will then be applied by man with complete understanding, and hence will be dominated by man."

As we see, Engels' formula does not speak at all in favour of those who think that under socialism economic laws can be abolished and new ones created. On the contrary, it demands not the abolition, but the understanding of economic laws and their intelligent application.

It is said that economic laws are elemental in character, that their action is inavertible and that society is powerless against them. That is not true. It is making a fetish of laws, and oneself the slave of laws. It has been demonstrated that society is not powerless against laws, that, having come to know economic laws and relying upon them, society can restrict their sphere of action, utilize them in the interests of society and "harness" them, just as in the case of the forces of nature and their laws, just

as in the case of the overflow of big rivers cited in the illustration above.

Reference is made to the specific role of Soviet government in building socialism, which allegedly enables it to abolish existing laws of economic development and to "form" new ones. That is also untrue.

The specific role of Soviet government was due to two circumstances: first, that what Soviet government had to do was not to replace one form of exploitation by another, as was the case in earlier revolutions, but to abolish exploitation altogether; second, that in view of the absence in the country of any ready-made rudiments of a socialist economy, it had to create new, socialist forms of economy, "starting from scratch," so to speak.

That was undoubtedly a difficult, complex and unprecedented task. Nevertheless, the Soviet government accomplished this task with credit. But it accomplished it not because it supposedly destroyed the existing economic laws and "formed" new ones, but only because it relied on the economic law that the relations of production must necessarily conform with the character of the productive forces. The productive forces of our country, especially in industry, were social in character, the form of ownership, on the other hand, was private, capitalistic. Relying on the economic law that the relations of production must necessarily conform with the character of the productive forces, the Soviet government socialized the means of production, made them

the property of the whole people, and thereby abolished the exploiting system and created socialist forms of economy. Had it not been for this law, and had the Soviet government not relied upon it, it could not have accomplished its mission.

The economic law that the relations of production must necessarily conform with the character of the productive forces has long been forcing its way to the forefront in capitalist countries. If is has failed so far to force its way into the open, it is because it is encountering powerful resistance on the part of obsolescent forces of society. Here we have another distinguishing feature of economic laws. Unlike the laws of natural science, where the discovery and application of a new law proceeds more or less smoothly, the discovery and application of a new law in the economic field, affecting as it does the interests of obsolescent forces of society, meets with the most powerful resistance on their part. A force, a social force, capable of overcoming this resistance, is therefore necessary. In our country, such a force was the alliance of the working class and the peasantry, who represented the overwhelming majority of society. There is no such force yet in other, capitalist countries. This explains the secret why the Soviet government was able to smash the old forces of society, and why in our country the economic law that the relations of production must necessarily conform with the character of the productive forces received full

scope.

It is said that the necessity for balanced (proportionate) development of the national economy in our country enables the Soviet government to abolish existing economic laws and to create new ones. That is absolutely untrue. Our yearly and five-yearly plans must not be confused with the objective economic law of balanced, proportionate development of the national economy. The law of balanced development of the national economy arose in opposition to the law of competition and anarchy of production under capitalism. It arose from the socialization of the means of production, after the law of competition and anarchy of production had lost its validity. It became operative because a socialist economy can be conducted only on the basis of the economic law of balanced development of the national economy. That means that the law of balanced development of the national economy makes it possible for our planning bodies to plan social production correctly. But possibility must not be confused with actuality. They are two different things. In order to turn the possibility into actuality, it is necessary to study this economic law, to master it, to learn to apply it with full understanding, and to compile such plans as fully reflect the requirements of this law. It cannot be said that the requirements of this economic law are fully reflected by our yearly and five-yearly plans.

It is said that some of the economic laws operating in our country under socialism, including the law of value, have been "transformed," or even "radically transformed," on the basis of planned economy. That is likewise untrue. Laws cannot be "transformed," still less "radically" transformed. If they can be transformed, then they can be abolished and replaced by other laws. The thesis that laws can be "transformed" is a relic of the incorrect formula that laws can be "abolished" or "formed." Although the formula that economic laws can be transformed has already been current in our country for a long time, it must be abandoned for the sake of accuracy. The sphere of action of this or that economic law may be restricted, its destructive action - that is, of course, if it is liable to be destructive - may be averted, but it cannot be "transformed" or "abolished."

Consequently, when we speak of "subjugating" natural forces or economic forces, of "dominating" them, etc., this does not mean that man can "abolish" or "form" scientific laws. On the contrary, it only means that man can discover laws, get to know them and master them, learn to apply them with full understanding, utilize them in the interests of society, and thus subjugate them, secure mastery over them.

Hence, the laws of political economy under socialism are objective laws, which reflect the fact that the processes of economic life are law-governed and operate independently of our will. People who deny this postulate are in point of fact denying science, and, by denying science, they are denying all possibility of prognosticat-

ion - and, consequently, are denying the possibility of directing economic activity.

It may be said that all this is correct and generally known; but that there is nothing new in it, and that it is therefore not worth spending time re-iterating generally known truths. Of course, there really is nothing new in this; but it would be a mistake to think that it is not worth spending time re-iterating certain truths that are well known to us. The fact is that we, the leading core, are joined every year by thousands of new and young forces who are ardently desirous of assisting us and ardently desirous of proving their worth, but who do not possess an adequate Marxist education, are unfamiliar with many truths that are well known to us, and are therefore compelled to grope in the darkness. They are staggered by the colossal achievements of Soviet government, they are dazzled by the extraordinary successes of the Soviet system, and they begin to imagine that Soviet government can "do anything," that "nothing is beyond it," that it can abolish scientific laws and form new ones. What are we to do with these comrades? How are we to educate them in Marxism-Leninism? I think that systematic re-iteration and patient explanation of so-called "generally known" truths is one of the best methods of educating these comrades in Marxism.

2. COMMODITY PRODUCTION UNDER SOCIALISM

Certain comrades affirm that the Party acted wrongly in preserving commodity production after it had assumed power and nationalized the means of production in our country. They consider that the Party should have banished commodity production there and then. In this connection they cite Engels, who says:

"The seizure of the means of production by society puts an end to commodity production, and therewith to the domination of the product over the producer." (See "Anti-Dühring.")

These comrades are profoundly mistaken.

Let us examine Engels' formula. Engels' formula cannot be considered fully clear and precise, because it does not indicate whether it is referring to the seizure by society of all or only part of the means of production, that is whether all or only part of the means of production are converted into public property. Hence, this formula of Engels' may be understood either way.

Elsewhere in "Anti-Dühring," Engels speaks of mastering "all the means of production," of taking possession of "all means of production." Hence, this formula of Engels has in mind the nationalization not of part, but of all the means of production, that is, the conversion into public property of the means of production not only of industry, but also of agriculture.

It follows from this that Engels has in

mind countries where capitalism and the concentration of production have advanced far enough both in industry and in agriculture to permit the expropriation of all the means of production in the country and their conversion into public property. Engels, consequently, considers that in such countries, parallel with the socialization of all the means of production, commodity production should be put an end to. And that, of course, is correct.

There was only one such country at the close of the last century, when "Anti-Dühring" was published - Britain. There the development of capitalism and the concentration of production both in industry and agriculture had reached such a point that it would have been possible, in the event of the assumption of power by the proletariat, to convert all the country's means of production into public property and to put an end to commodity production.

I leave aside in this instance the question of the importance of foreign trade to Britain and the vast part it plays in her national economy. I think that only after an investigation of this question can it be finally decided what would be the future of commodity production in Britain after the proletariat had assumed power and all the means of production had been nationalized.

However, not only at the close of the last century, but today too, no country has attained such a degree of development of capitalism and concentration of production in agriculture as is

to be observed in Britain. As to the other countries, notwithstanding the development of capitalism in the countryside, they still have a fairly numerous class of small and medium rural owner-producers, whose future would have to be decided if the proletariat should assume power.

But here is a question: what are the proletariat and its party to do in countries, ours being a case in point, where the conditions are favourable for the assumption of power by the proletariat and the overthrow of capitalism, where capitalism has so concentrated the means of production in industry that they may be expropriated and made the property of society, but where agriculture, notwithstanding the growth of capitalism, is divided up among numerous small and medium owner-producers to such an extent as to make it impossible to consider the expropriation of these producers?

To this question Engels' formula does not furnish an answer. Incidentally, it was not supposed to furnish an answer to it, since it arose from another question, namely, what should be the fate of commodity production after all the means of production had been socialized.

And so, what is to be done if not all, but only part of the means of production have been socialized, yet the conditions are favourable for the assumption of power by the proletariat - should the proletariat assume power, and should commodity production be abolished immediately after this?

We cannot, of course, consider an answer

the opinion of certain half-baked Marxists, who believe that under such conditions the thing to do is to refrain from taking power and to wait until capitalism has succeeded in ruining the millions of small and medium producers and converting them into farm labourers and in concentrating the means of production in agriculture, and that only after this would it be possible to consider the assumption of power by the proletariat and the socialization of all the means of production. Naturally, this is a "solution" which Marxists cannot accept if they do not want to disgrace themselves completely.

Nor can we consider an answer the opinion of other half-baked Marxists, who think that the thing to do would be to assume power and to expropriate the small and medium rural producers and to socialize their means of production. Marxists cannot adopt this senseless and criminal course either, because it would destroy all chances of victory for the socialist revolution, and would throw the peasantry into the camp of the enemies of the proletariat for a long time.

The answer to this question was given by Lenin in his writings on the "tax in kind" and in his celebrated "co-operative plan."

Lenin's answer may be briefly summed up as follows:

a) Favourable conditions for the assumption of power should not be missed - the proletariat should assume power without waiting until capitalism succeeded in ruining the millions of

small and medium individual producers;

b) The means of production in industry should be expropriated and converted into public property;

c) As to the small and medium individual producers, they should gradually be united in producers' co-operatives, i.e., in large agricultural enterprises, collective farms;

d) Industry should be developed to the utmost and the collective farms should be placed on the modern technical basis of large-scale production, not expropriating them, but on the contrary generously supplying them with first class tractors and other machines;

e) In order to ensure an economic bond between town and country, between industry and agriculture, commodity production (exchange through purchase and sale) should be preserved for a certain period, it being the form of economic tie with the town which is alone acceptable to the peasants, and Soviet trade - state, co-operative and collective farm - should be developed to the full and the capitalists of all types and descriptions ousted from trading activity.

The history of socialist construction in our country has shown that this path of development, mapped out by Lenin, has fully justified itself.

There can be no doubt that in the case of all capitalist countries with a more or less numerous class of small and medium producers, this path of development is the only possible

and expedient one for the victory of socialism.

It is said that commodity production must lead, is bound to lead, to capitalism all the same, under all conditions. That is not true. Not always and not under all conditions! Commodity production must not be identified with capitalist production. They are two different things. Capitalist production is the highest form of commodity production. Commodity production leads to capitalism only if there is private ownership of the means of production, if labour power appears on the market as a commodity which can be bought by the capitalist and exploited in the process of production, and if, consequently, the system of exploitation of wageworkers by capitalists exists in the country. Capitalist production begins when the means of production are concentrated in private hands, and when the workers are bereft of means of production and are compelled to sell their labour power as a commodity. Without this there is no such thing as capitalist production.

Well, and what is to be done if the conditions for the conversion of commodity production into capitalist production do not exist, if the means of production are no longer private but socialist property, if the system of wage labour no longer exists and labour power is no longer a commodity, and if the system of exploitation has long been abolished - can it be considered then that commodity production will lead to capitalism all the same? No, it cannot. Yet ours is precisely such a society, a society

where private ownership of the means of production, the system of wage labour, and the system of exploitation have long ceased to exist.

Commodity production must not be regarded as something sufficient unto itself, something independent of the surrounding economic conditions. Commodity production is older than capitalist production. It existed in slave-owning society, and served it, but did not lead to capitalism. It existed in feudal society and served it, yet, although it prepared some of the conditions for capitalist production, it did not lead to capitalism. Why then, one asks, cannot commodity production similarly serve our socialist society for a certain period without leading to capitalism, bearing in mind that in our country commodity production is not so boundless and all-embracing as it is under capitalist conditions, being confined within strict bounds thanks to such decisive economic conditions as social ownership of the means of production, the abolition of the system of wage labour, and the elimination of the system of exploitation?

It is said that, since the domination of social ownership of the means of production has been established in our country, and the system of wage labour and exploitation has been abolished, commodity production has lost all meaning and should therefore be done away with.

That is also untrue. Today there are two basic forms of socialist production in our country: state, or publicly owned production, and collective farm production, which cannot be said

to be publicly owned. In the state enterprises, the means of production and the product of production are national property. In the collective farm, although the means of production (land, machines) do belong to the state, the product of production is the property of the different collective farms, since the labour, as well as the seed, is their own, while the land, which has been turned over to the collective farms in perpetual tenure, is used by them virtually as their own property, in spite of the fact that they cannot sell, buy, lease or mortgage it.

The effect of this is that the state disposes only of the product of the state enterprises, while the product of the collective farms, being their property, is disposed of only by them. But the collective farms are unwilling to alienate their products except in the form of commodities, in exchange for which they desire to receive the commodities they need. At present the collective farms will not recognize any other economic relation with the town except the commodity relation - exchange through purchase and sale. Because of this, commodity production and trade are as much a necessity with us today as they were thirty years ago, say, when Lenin spoke of the necessity of developing trade to the utmost.

Of course, when instead of the two basic production sectors, the state sector and the collective farm sector, there will be only one all-embracing production sector, with the right to dispose of all the consumer goods produced in

the country, commodity circulation, with its "money economy," will disappear, as being an unnecessary element in the national economy. But so long as this is not the case, so long as the two basic production sectors remain, commodity production and commodity circulation must remain in force, as a necessary and very useful element in our system of national economy. How the formation of a single and united sector will come about, whether simply by the swallowing up of the collective farm sector by the state sector - which is hardly likely (because that would be looked upon as the expropriation of the collective farms) - or by the setting up of a single national economic body (comprising representatives of state industry and of the collective farms), with the right at first to keep account of all consumer product in the country, and eventually also to distribute it, by way, say, of products-exchange - is a special question which requires separate discussion.

Consequently, our commodity production is not of the ordinary type, but is a special kind of commodity production, commodity production without capitalists, which is concerned mainly with the goods of associated socialist producers (the state, the collective farms, the co-operatives), the sphere of action of which is confined to items of personal consumption, which obviously cannot possibly develop into capitalist production, and which, together with its "money economy," is designed to serve the development and consolidation of socialist production.

Absolutely mistaken, therefore, are those comrades who allege that, since socialist society has not abolished commodity forms of production, we are bound to have the reappearance of all the economic categories characteristic of capitalism: labour power as a commodity, surplus value, capital, capitalist profit, the average rate of profit, etc. These comrades confuse commodity production with capitalist production, and believe that once there is commodity production there must also be capitalist production. They do not realize that our commodity production radically differs from commodity production under capitalism.

More, I think that we must also discard certain other concepts taken from Marx's "Capital" - where Marx was concerned with an analysis of capitalism - and artificially pasted on to our socialist relations. I am referring to such concepts, among others, as "necessary" and "surplus" labour, "necessary" and "surplus" product, "necessary" and "surplus" time. Marx analyzed capitalism in order to elucidate the source of exploitation of the working class - surplus value - and to arm the working class, which was bereft of means of production, with an intellectual weapon for the overthrow of capitalism. It is natural that Marx used concepts (categories) which fully corresponded to capitalist relations. But it is strange, to say the least, to use these concepts now, when the working class is not only not bereft of power and means of production, but, on the contrary, is in possession of the power and controls the means of production. Talk of labour power being a commodity, and of "hiring" of workers sounds rather absurd now, under our system: as though the working class, which possesses means of production, hires itself and sells its labour power to itself. It is just as strange to speak now of "necessary" and "surplus" labour: as though, under our conditions, the labour contributed by the workers to society for the extension of production, the promotion of education and public health, the organization of defence, etc., is not just as necessary to the working class, now in power, as the labour expended to supply the personal needs of the worker and his family.

It should be remarked that in his "Critique of the Gotha Program," where it is no longer capitalism that he is investigating, but, among other things, the first phase of communist society, Marx recognizes labour contributed to society for extension of production, for education and public health, for administrative expenses, for building up reserves, etc., to be just as necessary as the labour expended to supply the consumption requirements of the working class.

I think that our economists should put an end to this incongruity between the old concepts and the new state of affairs in our socialist country, by replacing the old concepts with new ones that correspond to the new situation.

We could tolerate this incongruity for a certain period, but the time has come to put an end to it.

3. THE LAW OF VALUE UNDER SOCIALISM

It is sometimes asked whether the law of value exists and operates in our country, under the socialist system.

Yes, it does exist and does operate. Wherever commodities and commodity production exist, there the law of value must also exist.

In our country the sphere of operation of the law of value extends, first of all, to commodity circulation, to the exchange of commodities through purchase and sale, the exchange, chiefly, of articles of personal consumption. Here, in this sphere, the law of value preserves, within certain limits, of course, the function of a regulator.

But the operation of the law of value is not confined to the sphere of commodity circulation. It also extends to production. True, the law of value has no regulating function in our socialist production, but it nevertheless influences production, and this fact cannot be ignored when directing production. As a matter of fact, consumer goods, which are needed to compensate the labour power expended in the process of production, are produced and realized in our country as commodities coming under the operation of the law of value. It is precisely here that the law of value exercises its influence on production. In this connection, such things as cost accounting and profitableness, production costs, prices, etc., are of actual importance in our enterprises. Consequently, our enterprises

cannot, and must not, function without taking the law of value into account.

Is this a good thing? It is not a bad thing. Under present conditions, it really is not a bad thing, since it trains our business executives to conduct production on rational lines and disciplines them. It is not a bad thing because it teaches our executives to count production magnitudes, to count them accurately, and also to calculate the real things in production precisely, and not to talk nonsense about "approximate figures," spun out of thin air. It is not a bad thing because it teaches our executives to look for, find and utilize hidden reserves latent in production, and not to trample them underfoot. It is not a bad thing because it teaches our executives systematically to improve methods of production, to lower production costs, to practise cost accounting, and to make their enterprises pay. It is a good practical school which accelerates the development of our executive personnel and their growth into genuine leaders of socialist production at the present stage of development.

The trouble is not that production in our country is influenced by the law of value. The trouble is that our business executives and planners, with few exceptions, are poorly acquainted with the operations of the law of value, do not study them, and are unable to take account of them in their computations. This, in fact, explains the confusion that still reigns in the sphere of price-fixing policy. Here is one of

many examples. Some time ago it was decided to adjust the prices of cotton and grain in the interest of cotton growing, to establish more accurate prices for grain sold to the cotton growers, and to raise the prices of cotton delivered to the state. Our business executives and planners submitted a proposal on this score which could not but astound the members of the Central Committee, since it suggested fixing the price of a ton of grain at practically the same level as a ton of cotton, and, moreover, the price of a ton of grain was taken as equivalent to that of a ton of baked bread. In reply to remarks of the members of the Central Committee that the price of a ton of bread must be higher than that of a ton of grain, because of the additional expense of milling and baking, and that cotton was generally much dearer than grain, as was also borne out by their prices in the world market, the authors of the proposals could find nothing coherent to say. The Central Committee was therefore obliged to take the matter into its own hands and to lower the prices of grain and raise the prices of cotton. What would have happened if the proposals of these comrades had received legal force? We should have ruined the cotton growers and would have found ourselves without cotton.

But does this mean that the operation of the law of value has as much scope with us as it has under capitalism, and that it is the regulator of production in our country too? No, it does not. Actually, the sphere of operation of

the law of value under our economic system is strictly limited and placed within definite bounds. It has already been said that the sphere of operation of commodity production is restricted and placed within definite bounds by our system. The same must be said of the sphere of operation of the law of value. Undoubtedly, the fact that private ownership of the means of production does not exist, and that the means of production both in town and country are socialized, cannot but restrict the sphere of operation of the law of value and the extent of its influence on production.

In this same direction operates the law of balanced (proportionate) development of the national economy, which has superseded the law of competition and anarchy of production.

In this same direction, too, operate our yearly and five-yearly plans and our economic policy generally, which are based on the requirements of the law of balanced development of the national economy.

The effect of all this, taken together, is that the sphere of operation of the law of value in our country is strictly limited, and that the law of value cannot under our system function as the regulator of production.

This, indeed, explains the "striking" fact that whereas in our country, the law of value, in spite of the steady and rapid expansion of our socialist production, does not lead to crises of overproduction, in the capitalist countries this same law, whose sphere of operation is

very wide under capitalism, does lead, in spite of the low rate of expansion of production, to periodical crises of overproduction.

It is said that the law of value is a permanent law, binding upon all periods of historical development, and that if it does lose its function as a regulator of exchange relations in the second phase of communist society it retains at this phase of development its function as a regulator of the relations between the various branches of production, as a regulator of the distribution of labour among them.

That is quite untrue. Value, like the law of value, is a historical category connected with the existence of commodity production. With the disappearance of commodity production, value and its forms and the law of value also disappear.

In the second phase of communist society, the amount of labour expended on the production of goods will be measured not in a roundabout way, not through value and its forms, as is the case under commodity production, but directly and immediately - by the amount of time, the number of hours, expended on the production of goods. As to the distribution of labour, its distribution among the branches of production will be regulated not by the law of value, which will have ceased to function by that time, but by the growth of society's demand for goods. It will be a society in which production will be regulated by the requirements of society, and computation of the requirements of

society will acquire paramount importance for the planning bodies.

Totally incorrect, too, is the assertion that under our present economic system, in the first phase of development of communist society, the law of value regulates the "proportions" of labour distributed among the various branches of production.

If this were true, it would be incomprehensible why our light industries, which are the most profitable, are not being developed to the utmost, and why preference is given to our heavy industries, which are often less profitable, and sometimes altogether unprofitable.

If this were true, it would be incomprehensible why a number of our heavy industry plants which are still unprofitable and where the labour of the worker does not yield the "proper returns," are not closed down, and why new light industry plants, which would certainly be profitable and where the labour of the workers might yield "big returns," are not opened.

If this were true, it would be incomprehensible why workers are not transferred from plants that are less profitable, but very necessary to our national economy, to plants which are more profitable - in accordance with the law of value, which supposedly regulates the "proportions" of labour distributed among the branches of production.

Obviously, if we were to follow the lead of these comrades, we should have to cease giving primacy to the production of means of

production in favour of the production of articles of consumption. And what would be the effect of ceasing to give primacy to the production of the means of production? The effect would be to destroy the possibility of continuous expansion of our national economy, because the national economy cannot be continuously expanded without giving primacy to the production of means of production.

These comrades forget that the law of value can be a regulator of production only under capitalism, with private ownership of the means of production, and competition, anarchy of production, and crises of overproduction. They forget that in our country the sphere of operation of the law of value is limited by the social ownership of the means of production, and by the law of balanced development of the national economy, and is consequently also limited by our yearly and five-yearly plans, which are an approximate reflection of the requirements of this law.

Some comrades draw the conclusion from this that the law of balanced development of the national economy and economic planning annul the principle of profitableness of production. That is quite untrue. It is just the other way round. If profitableness is considered not from the standpoint of individual plants or industries, and not over a period of one year, but from the standpoint of the entire national economy and over a period of, say, ten or fifteen years, which is the only correct approach to the question, then the temporary and unstable profitableness of some plants or industries is beneath all comparison with that higher form of stable and permanent profitableness which we get from the operation of the law of balanced development of the national economy and from economic planning, which save us from periodical economic crises disruptive to the national economy and causing tremendous material damage to society, and which ensure a continuous and high rate of expansion of our national economy.

In brief, there can be no doubt that under our present socialist conditions of production, the law of value cannot be a "regulator of the proportions" of labour distributed among the various branches of production.

4. ABOLITION OF THE ANTITHESIS BETWEEN TOWN AND COUNTRY, AND BETWEEN MENTAL LABOUR AND PHYSICAL LABOUR, AND ELIMINATION OF DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN THEM

This heading covers a number of problems which essentially differ from one another. I combine them in one section, not in order to lump them together, but solely for brevity of exposition.

Abolition of the antithesis between town and country, between industry and agriculture, is a well-known problem which was discussed

long ago by Marx and Engels. The economic basis of this antithesis is the exploitation of the country by the town, the expropriation of the peasantry and the ruin of the majority of the rural population by the whole course of development of industry, trade and credit under capitalism. Hence, the antithesis between town and country under capitalism must be regarded as an antagonism of interests. This it was that gave rise to the hostile attitude of the country towards the town and towards "townfolk" in general.

Undoubtedly, with the abolition of capitalism and the exploiting system in our country, and with the consolidation of the socialist system, the antagonism of interests between town and country, between industry and agriculture, was also bound to disappear. And that is what happened. The immense assistance rendered by the socialist town, by our working class, to our peasantry in eliminating the landlords and kulaks strengthened the foundation for the alliance between the working class and the peasantry, while the systematic supply of first class tractors and other machines to the peasantry and its collective farms converted the alliance between the working class and the peasantry into friendship between them. Of course, the workers and the collective farm peasantry do represent two different classes differing from one another in status. But this difference does not weaken their friendship in any way. On the contrary, their interests lie along one common line, that

of strengthening the socialist system and attaining the victory of communism. It is not surprising, therefore, that not a trace remains of the former distrust, not to speak of the former hatred, of the country for the town.

All this means that the ground for antithesis between town and country, between industry and agriculture, has already been eliminated by our present socialist system.

This, of course, does not mean that the effect of the abolition of the antithesis between town and country will be that "the great towns will perish" (Engels, "Anti-Dühring"). Not only will the great towns not perish, but new great towns will appear as centres of the maximum development of culture, and as centres not only of large-scale industry, but also of the processing of agricultural produce and of powerful development of all branches of the food industry. This will facilitate the cultural progress of the nation and will tend to even up conditions of life in town and country.

We have a similar situation as regards the problem of the abolition of the antithesis between mental and physical labour. This too is a well-known problem which was discussed by Marx and Engels long ago. The economic basis of the antithesis between mental and physical labour is the exploitation of the physical workers by the mental workers. Everyone is familiar with the gulf which under capitalism divided the physical workers of enterprises from the managerial personnel. We know that this gulf gave

rise to a hostile attitude on the part of the workers towards managers, foremen, engineers and other members of the technical staff, whom the workers regarded as their enemies. Naturally, with the abolition of capitalism and the exploiting system, the antagonism of interests between physical and mental labour was also bound to disappear. And it really has disappeared in our present socialist system. Today, the physical workers and the managerial personnel are not enemies, but comrades and friends, members of a single collective body of producers who are vitally interested in the progress and improvement of production. Not a trace remains of the former enmity between them.

Of quite a different character is the problem of the disappearance of distinctions between town (industry) and country (agriculture), and between physical and mental labour. This problem was not discussed by the Marxian classics. It is a new problem, one that has been raised practically by our socialist construction.

Is this problem an imaginary one? Has it any practical or theoretical importance for us? No, this problem cannot be considered an imaginary one. On the contrary, it is for us a problem of the greatest seriousness.

Take, for instance, the distinction between agriculture and industry. In our country it consists not only in the fact that the conditions of labour in agriculture differ from those in industry, but, mainly and chiefly, in the fact that whereas in industry we have public ownership of

the means of production and of the product of industry, in agriculture we have not public, but group, collective farm ownership. It has already been said that this fact leads to the preservation of commodity circulation, and that only when this distinction between industry and agriculture disappears, can commodity production with all its attendant consequences also disappear. It therefore cannot be denied that the disappearance of this essential distinction between agriculture and industry must be a matter of paramount importance for us.

The same must be said of the problem of the abolition of the essential distinction between mental labour and physical labour. It too is a problem of paramount importance for us. Before the socialist emulation movement assumed mass proportions, the growth of our industry proceeded very haltingly, and many comrades even suggested that the rate of industrial development should be retarded. This was due chiefly to the fact that the cultural and technical level of the workers was too low and lagged far behind that of the technical personnel. But the situation changed radically when the socialist emulation movement assumed a mass character. It was from that moment on that industry began to advance at accelerated speed. Why did socialist emulation assume the character of a mass movement? Because among the workers whole groups of comrades came to the fore who had not only mastered the minimum requirements of technical knowledge, but had gone further and risen to

the level of the technical personnel; they began to correct technicians and engineers, to break down the existing norms as antiquated, to introduce new and more up-to-date norms, and so on. What should we have had if not only isolated groups, but the majority of the workers had raised their cultural and technical level to that of the engineering and technical personnel? Our industry would have risen to a height unattainable by industry in other countries. It therefore cannot be denied that the abolition of the essential distinction between mental and physical labour by raising the cultural and technical level of the workers to that of the technical personnel cannot but be of paramount importance to us.

Some comrades assert that in the course of time not only will the essential distinction between industry and agriculture, and between physical and mental labour, disappear, but so will all distinction between them. That is not true. Abolition of the essential distinction between industry and agriculture cannot lead to to the abolition of all distinction between them. Some distinction, even if inessential, will certainly remain, owing to the difference between the conditions of work in industry and and in agriculture. Even in industry the conditions of labour are not the same in all its branches: the conditions of labour, for example, of coal miners differ from those of the workers of a mechanized shoe factory, and the conditions of labour of ore miners from those of engineering workers. If that is so, then all the more must a certain distinction remain between industry and agriculture.

The same must be said of the distinction between mental and physical labour. The essential distinction between them, the difference in their cultural and technical levels, will certainly disappear. But some distinction, even if inessential, will remain. If only because the conditions of labour of the managerial staffs and those of the workers are not identical.

The comrades who assert the contrary do so presumably on the basis of the formulation given in some of my statements, which speaks of the abolition of the distinction between industry and agriculture, and between mental and physical labour, without any reservation to the effect that what is meant is the abolition of the essential distinction, not of all distinction. That is exactly how the comrades understood my formulation, assuming that it implied the abolition of all distinction. But this indicates that the formulation was unprecise, unsatisfactory. It must be discarded and replaced by another formulation, one that speaks of the abolition of essential distinctions and the persistence of inessential distinctions between industry and agriculture, and between mental and physical labour.

5. DISINTEGRATION OF THE SINGLE WORLD MARKET AND DEEPENING OF THE CRISIS OF THE WORLD CAPITALIST SYSTEM

The disintegration of the single all-embracing world market must be regarded as the most important economic sequel of the Second World War and of its economic consequences. It has had the effect of further deepening the general crisis of the world capitalist system.

The Second World War was itself a product of this crisis. Each of the two capitalist coalitions which locked horns in the war calculated on defeating its adversary and gaining world supremacy. It was in this that they sought a way out of the crisis. The United States of America hoped to put its most dangerous competitors, Germany and Japan, out of action, seize foreign markets and the world's raw material resources, and establish its world supremacy.

But the war did not justify these hopes. It is true that Germany and Japan were put out of action as competitors of the three major capitalist countries: the U.S.A., Great Britain and France. But at the same time China and other, European, people's democracies broke away from the capitalist system and, together with the Soviet Union, formed a united and powerful socialist camp confronting the camp of capitalism. The economic consequence of the existence of two opposite camps was that the single all-embracing world market disintegrated, so that now we have two parallel world markets, also confronting one another.

It should be observed that the U.S.A., Great Britain and France, themselves contributed - without themselves desiring it, of course - to the formation and consolidation of the new, parallel world market. They imposed an economic blockade on the U.S.S.R., China and the European people's democracies, which did not join the "Marshall plan" system, thinking thereby to strangle them. The effect, however, was not to strangle, but to strengthen the new world market.

But the fundamental thing, of course, is not the economic blockade, but the fact that since the war these countries have joined together economically and established economic co-operation and mutual assistance. The experience of this co-operation shows that not a single capitalist country could have rendered such effective and technically competent assistance to the People's Democracies as the Soviet Union is rendering them. The point is not only that this assistance is the cheapest possible and technically superb. The chief point is that at the bottom of this co-operation lies a sincere desire to help one another and to promote the economic progress of all. The result is a fast pace of industrial development in these countries. It may be confidently said that, with this pace of industrial development, it will soon come to pass that these countries will not only be in no need of imports from capitalist countries, but will feel themselves, the necessity of finding an outside

market for their surplus products.

But it follows from this that the sphere of exploitation of the world's resources by the major capitalist countries (U.S.A., Britain, France) will not expand, but contract; that their opportunities for sale in the world market will deteriorate, and that their industries will be operating more and more below capacity. That, in fact, is what is meant by the deepening of the general crisis of the world capitalist system in connection with the disintegration of the world market.

This is felt by the capitalists themselves, for it would be difficult for them not to feel the loss of such markets as the U.S.S.R. and China. They are trying to offset these difficulties with the "Marshall plan," the war in Korea, frantic rearmament and industrial militarization. But that is very much like a drowning man clutching at a straw.

This state of affairs has confronted the economists with two questions:

a) Can it be affirmed that the thesis expounded by Stalin before the Second World War regarding the relative stability of markets in the period of the general crisis of capitalism is still valid?

b) Can it be affirmed that the thesis expounded by Lenin in the spring of 1916 - namely, that, in spite of the decay of capitalism, "on the whole, capitalism is growing far more rapidly than before" - is still valid?

I think that it cannot. In view of the new

conditions to which the Second World War has given rise, both these theses must be regarded as having lost their validity.

6. INEVITABILITY OF WARS BETWEEN CAPITALIST COUNTRIES

Some comrades hold that, owing to the development of new international conditions since the Second World War, wars between capitalist countries have ceased to be inevitable. They consider that the contradictions between the socialist camp and the capitalist camp are more acute than the contradictions among the capitalist countries; that the U.S.A. has brought the other capitalist countries sufficiently under its sway to be able to prevent them going to war among themselves and weakening one another; that the foremost capitalist minds have been sufficiently taught by the two world wars and the severe damage they caused to the whole capitalist world not to venture to involve the capitalist countries in war with one another again - and that, because of all this, wars between capitalist countries are no longer inevitable.

These comrades are mistaken. They see the outward phenomena that come and go on the surface, but they do not see those profound forces which, although they are so far operating imperceptibly, will nevertheless determine the course of developments.

Ouwardly, everything would seem to be "going well": the U.S.A. has put Western Europe, Japan and other capitalist countries on rations; Germany (Western), Britain, France, Italy and Japan have fallen into the clutches of the U.S.A. and are meekly obeying its commands. But it would be mistaken to think that things can continue to "go well" for "all eternity," that these countries will tolerate the domination and oppression of the United States endlessly, that they will not endeavour to tear loose from American bondage and take the path of independent development.

Take, first of all, Britain and France. Undoubtedly, they are imperialist countries. Undoubtedly, cheap raw materials and secure markets are of paramount importance to them. Can it be assumed that they will endlessly tolerate the present situation, in which, under the guise of "Marshall plan aid," Americans are penetrating into the economies of Britain and France and trying to convert them into adjuncts of the United States economy, and American capital is seizing raw materials and markets in the British and French colonies and thereby plotting disaster for the high profits of the British and French capitalists? Would it not be truer to say that capitalist Britain, and, after her, capitalist France, will be compelled in the end to break from the embrace of the U.S.A. and enter into conflict with it in order to secure an independent position and, of course, high profits?

Let us pass to the major, vanquished countries, Germany (Western) and Japan. These countries are now languishing in misery under the jackboot of American imperialism. Their industry and agriculture, their trade, their foreign and home policies, and their whole life are fettered by the American occupation "regime." Yet only yesterday these countries were great imperialist powers and were shaking the foundations of the domination of Britain, the U.S.A. and France in Europe and Asia. To think that these countries will not try to get on their feet again, will not try to smash the American "regime," and force their way to independent development, is to believe in miracles.

It is said that the contradictions between capitalism and socialism are stronger than the contradictions among the capitalist countries. Thoretically, of course, that is true. It is not only true now, today; it was true before the Second World War. And it was more or less realized by the leaders of the capitalist countries. Yet the Second World War began not as a war with the U.S.S.R., but as a war between capitalist countries. Why? Firstly, because war with the U.S.S.R., as a socialist land, is more dangerous to capitalism than war between capitalist countries; for whereas war between capitalist countries puts in question only the supremacy of certain capitalist countries over others, war with the U.S.S.R. must certainly put in question the existence of capitalism itself. Secondly, because the capitalists, although they clamour, for

"propaganda" purposes, about the aggressiveness of the Soviet Union, do not themselves believe that it is aggressive, because they are aware of the Soviet Union's peaceful policy and know that it will not itself attack capitalist countries.

After the First World War it was similarly believed that Germany had been definitely put out of action, just as certain comrades now believe that Japan and Germany have been definitely put out of action. Then, too, it was said and clamoured in the press that the United States had put Europe on rations; that Germany would never rise to her feet again, and that there would be no more wars between capitalist countries. In spite of this, Germany rose to her feet again as a great power within the space of some fifteen or twenty years after her defeat, having broken out of bondage and taken the path of independent development. And it is significant that it was none other than Britain and the United States that helped Germany to recover economically, and to enhance her economic war potential. Of course, when the United States and Britain assisted Germany's economic recovery, they did so with a view to setting a recovered Germany against the Soviet Union, to utilizing her against the land of socialism. But Germany directed her forces in the first place against the Anglo-French-American bloc. And when Hitler Germany declared war on the Soviet Union, the Anglo-French-American bloc, far from joining with Hitler Germany, was compelled to enter into a coalition with the U.S.S.R.

against Hitler Germany.

Consequently, the struggle of the capitalist countries for markets and their desire to crush their competitors proved in practice to be stronger than the contradictions between the capitalist camp and the socialist camp.

What guarantee is there, then, that Germany and Japan will not rise to their feet again, will not attempt to break out of American bondage and live their own independent lives? I think there is no such guarantee.

But it follows from this that the inevitability of wars between capitalist countries remains in force.

It is said that Lenin's thesis that imperialism inevitably generates war must now be regarded as obsolete, since powerful popular forces have come forward today, in defence of peace and against another world war. That is not true.

The object of the present day peace movement is to rouse the masses of the people to fight for the preservation of peace and for the prevention of another world war. Consequently, the aim of this movement is not to overthrow capitalism and establish socialism - it confines itself to the democratic aim of preserving peace. In this respect, the present day peace movement differs from the movement of the time of the First World War for the conversion of the imperialist war into civil war, since the latter movement went farther and pursued socialist aims.

It is possible that in a definite conjuncture of circumstances the fight for peace will develop here or there into a fight for socialism. But then it will no longer be the present day peace movement; it will be a movement for the overthrow of capitalism.

What is most likely is that the present day peace movement, as a movement for the preservation of peace, will, if it succeeds, result in preventing a particular war, in its temporary postponement, in the temporary preservation of a particular peace, in the resignation of a bellicose government and its suppression by another that is prepared temporarily to keep the peace. That, of course, will be good. Even very good. But, all the same, it will not be enough to eliminate the inevitability of wars between capitalist countries generally. It will not be enough, because, for all the successes of the peace movement, imperialism will remain, continue in force - and, consequently, the inevitability of wars will also continue in force.

To eliminate the inevitability of war, it is necessary to abolish imperialism.

7. THE BASIC ECONOMIC LAWS OF MODERN CAPITALISM AND SOCIALISM

As you know, the question of the basic economic laws of capitalism and of socialism arose several times in the course of the discussion. Various views were expressed on this score, even the most fantastic. True, the ma-

jority of the participants in the discussion reacted feebly to the matter, and no decision on the point was indicated. However, none of the participants denied that such laws exist.

Is there a basic economic law of capitalism? Yes, there is. What is this law, and what are its characteristic features? The basic economic law of capitalism is such a law as determines not some particular aspect or particular process of the development of capitalist production, but all the principal aspects and all the principle processes of its development - one, consequently, which determines the essence of capitalist production, its essential nature.

Is the law of value the basic economic law of capitalism? No. The law of value is primarily a law of commodity production. It existed before capitalism, and, like commodity production, will continue to exist after the overthrow of capitalism, as it does, for instance, in our country, although, it is true, with a restricted sphere of operation. Having a wide sphere of operation in capitalist conditions, the law of value, of course, plays a big part in the development of capitalist production. But not only does it not determine the essence of capitalist production and the principles of capitalist profit; it does not even pose these problems. Therefore, it cannot be the basic economic law of modern capitalism.

For the same reasons, the law of competition and anarchy of production, or the law of uneven development of capitalism in the va-

rious countries cannot be the basic economic law of capitalism either.

It is said that the law of the average rate of profit is the basic economic law of modern capitalism. That is not true. Modern capitalism, monopoly capitalism, cannot content itself with the average profit, which moreover has a tendency to decline, in view of the increasing organic composition of capital. It is not the average profit, but the maximum profit that modern monopoly capitalism demands, which it needs for more or less regular extended reproduction.

Most appropriate to the concept of a basic economic law of capitalism is the law of surplus value, the law of the origin and growth of capitalist profit. It really does determine the basic features of capitalist production. But the law of surplus value is too general a law; it does not cover the problem of the highest rate of profit, the securing of which is a condition for the development of monopoly capitalism. In order to fill this hiatus, the law of surplus value must be made more concrete and developed further in adaptation to the conditions of monopoly capitalism, at the same time bearing in mind that monopoly capitalism demands not any sort of profit, but precisely the maximum profit. That will be the basic economic law of modern capitalism.

The main features and requirements of the basic economic law of modern capitalism might be formulated roughly in this way: the securing of the maximum capitalist profit through the ex-

ploitation, ruin and impoverishment of the majority of the population of the given country, through the enslavement and systematic robbery of the peoples of other countries, especially backward countries, and, lastly, through wars and militarization of the national economy, which are utilized for the obtaining of the highest profits.

It is said that the average profit might nevertheless be regarded as quite sufficient for capitalist development under modern conditions. That is not true. The average profit is the lowest point of profitableness, below which capitalist production becomes impossible. But it would be absurd to think that, in seizing colonies, subjugating peoples and engineering wars, the magnates of modern monopoly capitalism are striving to secure only the average profit. No [illegible] is not the average profit, nor yet supe[illegible] - which, as a rule, represents only a slight addition to the average profit - but precisely the maximum profit that is the motor of monopoly capitalism. It is precisely the necessity of securing the maximum profits that drives monopoly capitalism to such risky undertakings as the enslavement and systematic plunder of colonies and other backward countries, the conversion of a number of independent countries into dependent countries, the organization of new wars - which to the magnates of modern capitalism is the "business" best adapted to the extraction of the maximum profit - and, lastly, attempts to win world economic supremacy.

The importance of the basic economic law of capitalism consists, among other things, in the circumstance that, since it determines all the major phenomena in the development of the capitalist mode of production, its booms and crises, its victories and defeats, its merits and demerits - the whole process of its contradictory development - it enables us to understand and explain them.

Here is one of many "striking" examples.

We are all acquainted with facts from the history and practice of capitalism illustrative of the rapid development of technology under capitalism, when the capitalists appear as the standard-bearers of the most advanced techniques, as revolutionaries in the development of the technique of production. But we are also familiar with facts of a different kind, illustrative of a halt in technical development under capitalism, when the capitalists appear as reactionaries in the development of new techniques and not infrequently resort to hand labour.

How is this howling contradiction to be explained? It can only be explained by the basic economic law of modern capitalism, that is, by the necessity of obtaining the maximum profit. Capitalism is in favour of new techniques when they promise it the highest profit. Capitalism is against new techniques, and for resort to hand labour, when the new techniques do not promise the highest profit.

That is how matters stand with the basic economic law of modern capitalism.

Is there a basic economic law of socialism? Yes, there is. What are the essential features and requirements of this law? The essential features and requirements of the basic law of socialism might be formulated roughly in this way: the securing of the maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural requirements of the whole of society through the continuous expansion and perfection of socialist production on the basis of higher techniques.

Consequently: instead of maximum profits - maximum satisfaction of the material and cultural requirements of society; instead of development of production with breaks in continuity from boom to crisis and from crisis to boom - unbroken expansion of production; instead of periodic breaks in technical development, accompanied by destruction of the productive forces of society - an unbroken process of perfecting production on the basis of higher techniques.

It is said that the law of the balanced, proportionate development of the national economy is the basic economic law of socialism. That is not true. Balanced development of the national economy and, hence, economic planning, which is a more or less faithful reflection of this law, can yield nothing by themselves, if it is not known for what purpose economic development is planned, or if that purpose is not clear. The law of balanced development of the national economy can yield the desired result only if there is a purpose for the sake of which

economic development is planned. This purpose the law of balanced development of the national economy cannot itself provide. Still less can economic planning provide it. This purpose is inherent in the basic economic law of socialism, in the shape of its requirements, as expounded above. Consequently, the law of balanced development of the national economy can operate to its full scope only if its operation rests on the basic economic law of socialism.

As to economic planning, it can achieve positive results only if two conditions are observed: a) if it correctly reflects the requirements of the law of balanced development of the national economy, and b) if it conforms in every way to the requirements of the basic economic law of socialism.

3. OTHER QUESTIONS

1. Extra-economic coercion under feudalism.

Of course, extra-economic coercion did play a part in strengthening the economic power of the feudal landlords; however, not it, but feudal ownership of the land was the basis of feudalism.

2. Personal property of the collective farm household.

It would be wrong to say, as the draft textbook does, that "every household in a collective farm has in personal use a cow, small livestock and poultry." Actually, as we know, it

is not in personal use, but as a personal property that the collective farm household has its cow, small livestock, poultry, etc. The expression "in personal use" has evidently been taken from the "Model Rules of the Agricultural Artel." But a mistake was made in the "Model Rules of the Agricultural Artel." The Constitution of the U.S.S.R., which was drafted more carefully, puts it differently, viz.:

"Every household in a collective farm...has as its personal property a subsidiary husbandry on the plot, a dwelling house, livestock, poultry and minor agricultural implements."

That, of course, is correct.

It would be well, in addition, to state more particularly that every collective farmer has as his personal property from one to so-many cows, depending on local conditions, so-many sheep, goats, pigs (also from-to, depending on local conditions), and an unlimited quantity of poultry (ducks, geese, hens, turkeys).

Such detailed particulars are of great importance for our comrades abroad, who want to know what exactly has remained as the personal property of the collective farm household now that agriculture in our country has been collectivized.

3. Total rent paid by the peasants to the landlords; also total expenditure on the purchase of land.

The draft textbook says that as a result of the nationalization of the land, "the peasantry were released from paying rent to the land-

lords to a total of about 500 million roubles annually," (it should be "gold" roubles). This figure should be verified, because it seems to me that it does not include the rent paid over the whole of Russia, but only in a majority of the Russian gubernias. It should also be borne in mind that in some of the border regions of Russia rent was paid in kind, a fact which the authors of the draft textbook have evidently overlooked. Furthermore, it should be remembered that the peasants were released not only from the payment of rent, but also from annual expenditure for the purchase of land. Was this taken into account in the draft textbook? It seems to me that it was not; but it should have been.

4. Coalescence of the monopolies with the state machine.

The word "coalescence" is not appropriate. It superficially and descriptively notes the process of merging of the monopolies with the state, but it does not reveal the economic import of this process. The fact of the matter is that the merging process is not simply a process of coalescence, but the subjugation of the state machine to the monopolies. The word "coalescence" should therefore be discarded and replaced by the words "subjugation of the state machine to the monopolies."

5. The use of machines in the U.S.S.R.

The draft textbook says that "in the U.S.S.R. machines are used in all cases when they economize the labour of society." That is by no means what should be said. In the first

place, machines in the U.S.S.R. always economize the labour of society, and we accordingly do not know of any cases when, in the U.S.S.R., they have not economized the labour of society. In the second place, machines not only economize labour; they also lighten the labour of the worker, and accordingly, in our conditions, in contradistinction to the conditions of capitalism, the workers use machines in the processes of labour with the greatest eagerness.

It should therefore be said that nowhere are machines used so willingly as in the U.S.S.R., because they economize the labour of society and lighten the labour of the worker, and, as there is no unemployment in the U.S.S.R., the workers use machines in the national economy with the greatest eagerness.

6. Living standards of the working class in capitalist countries.

Usually, when speaking of the living standards of the working class, what is meant is only the standards of employed workers, and not of what is known as the reserve army of unemployed. Is such an attitude to the question of the living standards of the working class correct? I think it is not. If there is a reserve army of unemployed whose members cannot live except by the sale of their labour power, then the unemployed must necessarily form part of the working class; and if they do form part of the working class, then their destitute condition cannot but influence the living standards of the workers engaged in production. I therefore think that

when describing the living standards of the working class in capitalist countries, the condition of the reserve army of unemployed workers should also be taken into account.

7. National income.

I think it absolutely necessary to add a chapter on national income to the draft textbook.

8. Should there be a special chapter in the textbook on Lenin and Stalin as the founders of the political economy of socialism?

I think that the chapter, "The Marxist Theory of Socialism. Founding of the Political Economy of Socialism by V.I. Lenin and J.V. Stalin," should be excluded from the textbook. It is entirely unnecessary, since it adds nothing, and only colourlessly reiterates what has already been said in greater detail in earlier chapters of the textbook.

As regards the other questions, I have no remarks to make on the "Proposals" of Comrades Ostrovityanov, Leontyev, Shepilov, Gatovsky, etc.

9. INTERNATIONAL IMPORTANCE OF A MARXIAN TEXTBOOK ON POLITICAL ECONOMY

I think that the comrades do not appreciate the importance of a Marxist textbook on political economy as fully as they should. It is needed not only by our Soviet youth. It is particularly needed by Communists and communist

sympathizers in all countries. Our comrades abroad want to know how we broke out of capitalist slavery; how we rebuilt the economy of our country on socialist lines; how we secured the friendship of the peasantry; how we managed to convert a country which was only so recently poverty-stricken and weak into a rich and mighty country; what are the collective farms; why, although the means of production are socialized, we do not abolish commodity production, money, trade, etc. They want to know all this, and much else, not out of mere curiosity, but in order to learn from us and to utilize our experience in their own countries. Consequently, the appearance of a good Marxian textbook on political economy is not only of political importance at home, but also of great international importance.

What is needed, therefore, is a textbook which might serve as a reference book for the revolutionary youth not only at home, but also abroad. It must not be too bulky, because an over-bulky textbook cannot be a reference book and is difficult to assimilate, to master. But it must contain everything fundamental relating both to the economy of our country and to the economy of capitalism and the colonial system.

During the discussion, some comrades proposed the inclusion in the textbook of a number of additional chapters: the historians - on history, the politicians - on politics, the philosophers - on philosophy, the economists - on economics. But the effect of this would be to swell

the textbook to unwieldy dimensions. That, of course, must not be done. The textbook employs the historical method to illustrate problems of political economy, but that does not mean that we must turn a textbook on political economy into a history of economic relations.

What we need is a textbook of 500, at most 600 pages - not more. That will be a reference book on Marxian political economy - and an excellent gift to the young Communists of all countries.

Incidentally, in view of the inadequate level of Marxist development of the majority of the Communist parties abroad, such a textbook might also be of great use to communist cadres abroad who are no longer young.

10. WAYS OF IMPROVING THE DRAFT TEXTBOOK ON POLITICAL ECONOMY

During the discussion some comrades "ran down" the draft textbook much too assiduously, berated its authors for errors and oversights, and claimed that the draft was a failure. That is unfair. Of course, there are errors and oversights in the textbook - they are to be found in practically every big undertaking. Be that as it may, the overwhelming majority of the participants in the discussion were nevertheless of the opinion that the draft might serve as a basis for the future textbook, and only needed certain corrections and additions. Indeed, one has only

to compare the draft with the textbooks on political economy already in circulation to see that the draft stands head and shoulders above them. For that the authors of the draft deserve great credit.

I think that in order to improve the draft textbook, it would be well to appoint a small committee which would include not only the authors of the textbook, and not only supporters, but also opponents of the majority of the participants in the discussion, out-and-out critics of the draft textbook.

It would also be well to include in the committee a competent statistician to verify the figures and to supply additional statistical material for the draft, as well as a competent jurist to verify the accuracy of the formulations.

The members of the committee should be temporarily relieved of all other work and should be well provided for, so that they might devote themselves entirely to the textbook.

Furthermore, it would be well to appoint an editorial committee, of three persons, say, to take care of the final editing of the textbook. This is necessary also in order to achieve unity of style, which, unfortunately, the draft textbook lacks.

Time limit for presentation of the finished textbook to the Central Committee - one year.

J. STALIN
February 1, 1952.

REPLY TO
COMRADE ALEXANDER ILYICH NOTKIN

Comrade Notkin,

I was in no hurry to reply, because I saw no urgency in the questions you raised. All the more that there are other questions which are urgent, and which naturally deflected attention from your letter.

I shall answer point by point.

The first point.

There is a statement in the "Remarks" to the effect that society is not powerless against the laws of science, that man, having come to know economic laws, can utilize them in the interests of society. You assert that this postulate cannot be extended to other social formations, that it holds good only under socialism and communism, that the elemental character of the economic processes under capitalism, for example, makes it impossible for society to utilize economic laws in the interests of society.

That is not true. At the time of the bourgeois revolution in France, for instance, the bourgeoisie utilized against feudalism the law that relations of production must necessarily conform with the character of the productive forces, overthrew the feudal relations of production, created new, bourgeois relations of production, and brought them into conformity with the character of the productive forces which had

arisen in the bosom of the feudal system. The bourgeoisie did this not because of any particular abilities it possessed, but because it was vitally interested in doing so. The feudalists put up resistance to this not from stupidity, but because they were vitally interested in preventing this law from becoming effective.

The same must be said of the socialist revolution in our country. The working class utilized the law that the relations of production must necessarily conform with the character of the productive forces, overthrew the bourgeois relations of production, created new, socialist relations of production and brought them into conformity with the character of the productive forces. It was able to do so not because of any particular abilities it possessed, but because it was vitally interested in doing so. The bourgeoisie, which from an advanced force at the dawn of the bourgeois revolution had already become a counter-revolutionary force, offered every resistance to the implementation of this law - and it did so not because it lacked organization, and not because the elemental nature of economic processes drove it to resist, but chiefly because it was to its vital interest that the law should not become operative.

Consequently:

1. Economic processes, economic laws are in one degree or another utilized in the interests of society not only under socialism and communism, but under other formations as well.

2. The utilization of economic laws in

class society always and everywhere has a class background to it, and, moreover, always and everywhere the champion of the utilization of economic laws in the interests of society is the advanced class, while the obsolescent classes resist it.

The difference in this matter between the proletariat and the other classes which at any time in the course of history revolutionized the relations of production consists in the fact that the class interests of the proletariat merge with the interests of the overwhelming majority of society, because proletarian revolution implies the abolition not of one or another form of exploitation, but of all exploitation, while the revolutions of other classes, which abolished only one or other form of exploitation, were confined within the limits of their narrow class interests, which conflicted with the interests of the majority of society.

The "Remarks" speak of the class background of the utilization of economic laws in the interests of society. It is stated there that "unlike the laws of natural science, where the discovery and application of a new law proceeds more or less smoothly, the discovery and application of a new law in the economic field, affecting as it does the interests of obsolescent forces of society, meets with the most powerful resistance on their part." This point you missed.

The second point.

You assert that complete conformity of

the relations of production with the the character of the productive forces can be achieved only under socialism and communism, and that under other formations the conformity can only be partial.

That is not true. In the epoch following the bourgeois revolution, when the bourgeisie had shattered the feudal relations of production and established bourgeois relations of production, there undoubtedly were periods when the bourgeois production relations did fully conform with the character of the productive forces. Otherwise, capitalism could not have developed as swiftly as it did after the bourgeois revolution.

Further, the words "full conformity" must not be understood in the absolute sense.They must not be understood as meaning that there is no lagging of the relations of production behind the growth of the productive forces under socialism. The productive forces are the most mobile and revolutionary forces of production. They undeniably move in advance of the relations of production even under socialism.Only after a certain lapse of time do the relations of production change in line with the character of the productive forces.

How, then, are the words "full conformity" to be understood? They are to be understood as meaning that under socialism things do not usually go to the length of a conflict between the relations of production and the productive forces, that society is in a position to take timely steps to bring the lagging relations of product-

ion into conformity with the character of the productive forces. Socialist society is in a position to do so because it does not include obsolescent classes that might organize resistance. Of course, even under socialism there will be backward, inert forces that do not realize the necessity for changing the relations of production; but they, of course, will not be difficult to overcome without bringing matters to a conflict.

The third point.

It appears from your argument that you regard the means of production, and, in the first place, the implements of production produced by our nationalized enterprises, as commodities.

Can means of production be regarded as commodities in our socialist system? In my opinion they certainly cannot.

A commodity is a product which may be sold to any purchaser, and when its owner sells it, he loses ownership of it and the purchaser becomes the owner of the commodity, which he may resell, pledge or allow to rot. Do means of production come within this category? They obviously do not. In the first place, means of production are not "sold" to any purchaser, they are not "sold" even to collective farms; they are only allocated by the state to its enterprises. In the second place, when transferring means of production to any enterprise, their owner - the state - does not at all lose the ownership of them; on the contrary, it retains

it fully. In the third place, directors of enterprises who receive means of production from the Soviet state, far from becoming their owners, are deemed to be the agents of the state in the utilization of the means of production in accordance with the plans established by the state.

It will be seen, then, that under our system means of production can certainly not be classed in the category of commodities.

Why, in that case, do we speak of the value of means of production, their cost of production, their price, etc.?

For two reasons.

Firstly, this is needed for the purposes of calculation and settlement, for determining whether enterprises are paying or running at a loss, for checking and controlling the enterprises. But that is only the formal aspect of the matter.

Secondly, it is needed in order, in the interests of our foreign trade, to conduct sales of means of production to foreign countries. Here, in the sphere of foreign trade, but only in this sphere, our means of production really are commodities, and really are sold (in the direct meaning of the term).

It therefore follows that in the sphere of foreign trade the means of production produced by our enterprises retain the properties of commodities both essentially and formally, but that in the sphere of domestic economic circulation, means of production lose the properties of com-

modities, cease to be commodities and pass out of the sphere of operation of the law of value, retaining only the outward integument of commodities (calculation, etc.).

How is this peculiarity to be explained?

The fact of the matter is that in our socialist conditions economic development proceeds not by way of upheavals, but by way of gradual changes, the old not simply being abolished out of hand, but changing its nature in adaptation to the new, and retaining only its form; while the new does not simply destroy the old, but infiltrates into it, changes its nature and its functions, without smashing its form, but utilizing it for the development of the new. This, in our economic circulation, is true not only of commodities, but also of money, as well as of banks, which, while they lose their old functions and acquire new ones, preserve their old form, which is utilized by the socialist system.

If the matter is approached from the formal angle, from the angle of the processes taking place on the surface of phenomena, one may arrive at the incorrect conclusion that the categories of capitalism retain their validity under our economy. If, however, the matter is approached from the standpoint of Marxist analysis, which strictly distinguishes between the substance of an economic process and its form, between the deep processes of development and the surface phenomena, one comes to the only correct conclusion, namely, that it is chiefly the form, the outward appearance, of the old categories of capitalism that have remained in our country, but that their essence has radically changed in adaptation to the requirements of the development of the socialist economy.

The fourth point.

You assert that the law of value exercises a regulating influence on the prices of the "means of production" produced by agriculture and delivered to the state at the procurement prices. You refer to such "means of production" as raw materials - cotton, for instance. You might have added flax, wool and other agricultural raw materials.

It should first of all be observed that in this case it is not "means of production" that agriculture produces, but only one of the means of production - raw materials. The words "means of production" should not be juggled with. When Marxists speak of the production of means of production, what they primarily have in mind is the production of implements of production, what Marx calls "the instruments of labour, those of a mechanical nature, which, taken as a whole, we may call the bone and muscles of production," which constitute the "characteristics of a given epoch of production." To equate a part of the means of production (raw materials) with the means of production, including the implements of production, is to sin against Marxism, because Marxism considers that the implements of production play a decisive role com-

pared with all other means of production. Everyone knows that, by themselves, raw materials cannot produce implements of production, although certain kinds of raw material are necessary for the production of implements of production, while no raw material can be produced without implements of production.

Further, is the influence of the law of value on the price of raw materials produced by agriculture a regulating influence, as you, Comrade Notkin, claim? It would be a regulating one, if prices of agricultural raw materials had "free" play in our country, if the law of competition and anarchy of production prevailed, if we did not have a planned economy, and if the production of raw materials were not regulated by plan. But since all these "ifs" are missing in our economic system, the influence of the law of value on the price of agricultural raw materials cannot be a regulating one. In the first place, in our country prices of agricultural raw materials are fixed, established by plan, and are not "free." In the second place, the quantities of agricultural raw materials produced are not determined spontaneously or by chance elements, but by plan. In the third place, the implements of production needed for the producing of agricultural raw materials are concentrated not in the hands of individuals, or groups of individuals, but in the hands of the state. What then, after this, remains of the regulating function of the law of value? It appears that the law of value is itself regulated by the above-mentioned

factors characteristic of socialist production.

Consequently, it cannot be denied that the law of value does influence the formation of prices of agricultural raw materials, that it is one of the factors in this process. But still less can it be denied that its influence is not, and cannot be, a regulating one.

The fifth point.

When speaking, in my "Remarks," of the profitableness of the socialist national economy, I was controverting certain comrades who allege that, by not giving great preference to profitable enterprises, and by tolerating the existence side by side with them of unprofitable enterprises, our planned economy is killing the very principle of profitableness of economic undertakings. The "Remarks" say that profitableness considered from the standpoint of individual plants or industries is beneath all comparison with that higher form of profitableness which we get from our socialist mode of production, which saves us from crises of overproduction and ensures us a continuous expansion of production.

But it would be mistaken to conclude from this that the profitableness of individual plants and industries is of no particular value and is not deserving of serious attention. That, of course, is not true. The profitableness of individual plants and industries is of immense value for the development of our industry. It must be

taken into account both when planning construction and when planning production. It is an elementary requirement of our economic activity at the present stage of development.

The sixth point.

It is not clear how your words "extended production in strongly deformed guise" in reference to capitalism are to be understood. It should be said that such production, and extended production, at that, does not occur in nature.

It is evident that, after the world market has split, and the sphere of exploitation of the world's resources by the major capitalist countries (U.S.A., Britain, France) has begun to contract, the cyclical character of the development of capitalism - expansion and contraction of production - must continue to operate. However, expansion of production in these countries will proceed on a narrower basis, since the volume of production in these countries will diminish.

The seventh point.

The general crisis of the world capitalist system began in the period of the First World War, particularly due to the falling away of the Soviet Union from the capitalist system. That was the first stage in the general crisis. A second stage in the general crisis developed in the period of the Second World War, especially after the European and Asian people's democracies

fell away from the capitalist system. The first crisis, in the period of the First World War, and the second crisis, in the period of the Second World War, must not be regarded as separate, unconnected and independent crises, but as stages in the development of the general crisis of the world capitalist system.

Is the general crisis of world capitalism only a political, or only an economic crisis? Neither the one, nor the other. It is a general, i.e., all-round crisis of the world capitalist system, embracing both the economic and the political spheres. And it is clear that at the bottom of it lies the ever-increasing decay of the world capitalist economic system, on the one hand, and the growing economic might of the countries which have fallen away from capitalism - the U.S.S.R., China and the other people's democracies - on the other.

J. STALIN

April 21, 1952.

CONCERNING THE ERRORS OF COMRADE L.D. YAROSHENKO

Some time ago the members of the Political Bureau of the C.C., C.P.S.U.(B.) received a letter from Comrade Yaroshenko, dated March 20, 1952, on a number of economic questions which were debated at the November discussion. The author of the letter complains that the ba-

sic documents summing up the discussion, and Comrade Stalin's "Remarks," "contain no reflection whatever of the opinion" of Comrade Yaroshenko. Comrade Yaroshenko also suggests in his note that he should be allowed to write a "Political Economy of Socialism," to be completed in a year or a year and a half, and that he should be given two assistants to help him in the work.

I think that both Comrade Yaroshenko's complaint and his proposal need to be examined on their merits.

Let us begin with the complaint.

Well, then, what is the "opinion" of Comrade Yaroshenko which has received no reflection whatever in the above-mentioned documents?

I

COMRADE YAROSHENKO'S CHIEF ERROR

To describe Comrade Yaroshenko's opinion in a couple of words, it should be said that it is un-Marxian - and, hence, profoundly erroneous.

Comrade Yaroshenko's chief error is that he forsakes the Marxist position on the question of the role of the productive forces and of the relations of production in the development of society, that he inordinately overrates the role of the productive forces, and just as inordinately underrates the role of the relations of production, and ends up by declaring that under socialism the relations of production are a component part of the productive forces.

Comrade Yaroshenko is prepared to grant the relations of production a certain role under the conditions of "antagonistic class contradictions," inasmuch as there the relations of production "run counter to the development of the productive forces." But he confines it to a purely negative role, the role of a factor which retards the development of the productive forces, which fetters their development. Any other functions, positive functions, of the relations of production, Comrade Yaroshenko fails to see.

As to the socialist system, where "antagonistic class contradictions" no longer exist, and where the relations of production "no longer run counter to the development of the productive forces," here, according to Comrade Yaroshenko, the relations of production lose every vestige of an independent role, they cease to be a serious factor of development, and are absorbed by the productive forces, becoming a component part of them. Under socialism, Comrade Yaroshenko says, "men's production relations become part of the organization of the productive forces, as a means, an element of their organization." (Comrade Yaroshenko's letter to the Political Bureau of the C.C.)

If that is so, what is the chief task of a "Political Economy of Socialism"? Comrade Yaroshenko replies: "The chief problem of the "Political Economy of Socialism," therefore, is not to investigate the relations of production of the

members of socialist society; it is to elaborate and develop a scientific theory of the organization of the productive forces in social production, a theory of the planning of economic development." (Comrade Yaroshenko's speech at the Plenary Discussion.)

That, in fact, explains why Comrade Yaroshenko is not interested in such economic questions of the socialist system as the existence of different forms of property in our economy, commodity circulation, the law of value, etc., which he believes to be minor questions that only give rise to scholastic disputes. He plainly declares that in his "Political Economy of Socialism," "disputes as to the role of any particular category of socialist political economy - value, commodity, money, credit, etc., - which very often with us are of a scholastic character, are replaced by a healthy discussion of the rational organization of the productive forces in social production, by a scientific demonstration of the validity of such organization." (Comrade Yaroshenko's speech in the Discussion Working Panel.)

In short, political economy without economic problems.

Comrade Yaroshenko thinks that it is enough to arrange a "rational organization of the productive forces," and the transition from socialism to communism will take place without any particular difficulty. He considers that this is quite sufficient for the transition to communism. He plainly declares that "under socialism,

the basic struggle for the building of a communist society reduces itself to a struggle for the proper organization of the productive forces and their rational utilization in social production." (Speech at the Plenary Discussion.) Comrade Yaroshenko solemnly proclaims that "Communism is the highest scientific organization of the productive forces in social production."

It appears, then, that the essence of the communist system begins and ends with the "rational organization of the productive forces."

From all this, Comrade Yaroshenko concludes that there cannot be a single Political Economy for all social formations, that there must be two political economies: one for pre-socialist social formations, the subject of investigation of which is men's relations of production, and the other for the socialist system, the subject of investigation of which should be not the production, i.e., the economic, relations, but the rational organization of the productive forces.

Such is the opinion of Comrade Yaroshenko.

What can be said of this opinion?

It is not true, in the first place, that the role of the relations of production in the history of society has been confined to that of a brake, a fetter on the development of the productive forces. When Marxists speak of the retarding role of the relations of production, it is not all relations of production they have in mind, but only the old relations of production, which no longer conform to the growth of the productive

forces and, consequently, retard their development. But, as we know, besides the old, there are also new relations of production, which supersede the old. Can it be said that the role of the new relations of production is that of a brake on the productive forces? No, it cannot. On the contrary, the new relations of production are the chief and decisive force, the one which in fact determines the further, and, moreover, powerful development of the productive forces, and without which the latter would be doomed to stagnation, as is the case today in the capitalist countries.

Nobody can deny that the development of the productive forces of our Soviet industry has made tremendous strides in the period of the five-year plans. But this development would not have occurred if we had not, in October 1917, replaced the old, capitalist relations of production by new, socialist relations of production. Without this revolution in the production, the economic, relations of our country, our productive forces would have stagnated, just as they are stagnating today in the capitalist countries.

Nobody can deny that the development of the productive forces of our agriculture has made tremendous strides in the past twenty or twenty-five years. But this development would not have occurred if we had not, in the thirties, replaced the old, capitalist production relations in the countryside by new, collectivist production relations. Without this revolution in production, the productive forces of our agriculure

would have stagnated, just as they are stagnating today in the capitalist countries.

Of course, new relations of production cannot, and do not, remain new forever; they begin to grow old and to run counter to the further development of the productive forces; they begin to lose their role of principal mainspring of the productive forces, and become a brake on them. At this point, in place of these production relations which have become antiquated, new production relations appear whose role it is to be the principal mainspring spurring the further development of the productive forces.

This peculiar development of the relations of production from the role of a brake on the productive forces to that of the principal mainspring impelling them forward, and from the role of principal mainspring to that of a brake on the productive forces, constitutes one of the chief elements of the Marxian materialist dialectics. Every novice in Marxism knows that nowadays. But Comrade Yaroshenko, it appears, does not know it.

It is not true, in the second place, that the production, i.e., the economic, relations lose their independent role under socialism, that they are absorbed by the productive forces, that social production under socialism is reduced to the organization of the productive forces. Marxism regards social production as an integral whole which has two inseperable sides: the productive forces of society (the relation of society to the forces of nature, in contest with which it sec-

ures the material values it needs), and the relations of production (the relations of men to one another in the process of production). These are two different sides of social production, although they are inseparably connected with one another. And just because they constitute different sides of social production, they are able to influence one another. To assert that one of these sides may be absorbed by the other and be converted into its component part, is to commit a very grave sin against Marxism.

Marx said:

In production men not only act on nature but also on one another. They produce only by co-operating in a certain way and mutually exchanging their activities. In order to produce, they enter into definite connections and relations with one another and only within these social connections and relations does their action on nature take place." (K. Marx and F. Engels, Vol. V, p. 429.)

Consequently, social production consists of two sides, which, although they are inseparably connected, reflect two different categories of relations: the relations of men to nature (productive forces), and the relations of men to one another in the process of production (production relations). Only when both sides of production are present do we have social production, whether it be under the socialist system or under any other social formation.

Comrade Yaroshenko, evidently, is not quite in agreement with Marx. He considers that

this postulate of Marx is not applicable to the socialist system. Precisely for this reason he reduces the problem of the Political Economy of Socialism to the rational organization of the productive forces, discarding the production, the economic, relations and severing the productive forces from them.

If we followed Comrade Yaroshenko, therefore, what we would get is, instead of a Marxian Political Economy, something in the nature of Bogdanov's "Universal Organizing Science."

Hence, starting from the right idea that the productive forces are the most mobile and revolutionary forces of production, Comrade Yaroshenko reduces the idea to an absurdity, to the point of denying the role of the production, the economic, relations under socialism; and instead of a full-blooded social production, what he gets is a lopsided and scraggy technology of production - something in the nature of Bukharin's "technique of social organization."

Marx says:

"In the social production of their life (that is, in the production of the material values necessary to the life of men -J. St.), men enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces. The sum total of these relations of production constitute the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond

definite forms of social consciousness." ("A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy" - Preface.)

This means that every social formation, socialist society not excluded, has its economic foundation, consisting of the sum total of men's relations of production. What, one asks, happens to the economic foundation of the socialist system with Comrade Yaroshenko? As we know, Comrade Yaroshenko has already done away with relations of production under socialism as a more or less independent sphere, and has included the little that remains of them in the organization of the productive forces. Has the socialist system, one asks, its own economic foundation? Obviously, seeing that the relations of production have disappeared as a more or less independent factor under socialism, the socialist system is left without an economic foundation.

In short, a socialist system without an economic foundation. A rather funny situation...

Is a social system without an economic foundation possible at all? Comrade Yaroshenko evidently believes that it is. Marxism, however, believes that such social systems do not occur in nature.

It is not true, lastly, that communism means the rational organization of the productive forces, that the rational organization of the productive forces is the beginning and end of the communist system, that it is only necessary to organize the productive forces rationally, and the transition to communism will take place

without particular difficulty. There is in our literature another definition, another formula of communism - Lenin's formula: "Communism is Soviet rule plus the electrification of the whole country." Lenin's formula is evidently not to Comrade Yaroshenko's liking, and he replaces it with his own homemade formula: "Communism is the highest scientific organization of the productive forces in social production."

In the first place, nobody knows what this "higher scientific" or "rational" organization of the productive forces which Comrade Yaroshenko advertises represents, what its concrete import is. In his speeches at the Plenum and in the working panels of the discussion, and in his letter to the members of the Political Bureau, Comrade Yaroshenko reiterates this mythical formula dozens of times, but nowhere does he say a single word to explain how the "rational organization" of the productive forces, which supposedly constitutes the beginning and end of the essence of the communist system, should be understood.

In the second place, if a choice must be made between the two formulas, then it is not Lenin's formula, which is the only correct one, that should be discarded, but Comrade Yaroshenko's pseudo-formula, which is so obviously chimerical and un-Marxian, and is borrowed from the arsenal of Bogdanov, from his "Universal Organizing Science."

Comrade Yaroshenko thinks that we have only to ensure a rational organization of the

productive forces, and we shall be able to obtain an abundance of products and to pass to communism, to pass from the formula, "to each according to his work," to the formula, "to each according to his needs." That is a profound error, and reveals a complete lack of understanding of the laws of economic development of socialism. Comrade Yaroshenko's conception of the conditions for the transition from socialism to communism is far too rudimentary and puerile. He does not understand that neither an abundance of products, capable of covering all the requirements of society, nor the transition to the formula "to each according to his needs," can be brought about if such economic factors as collective farm, group, property, commodity circulation, etc., remain in force. Comrade Yaroshenko does not understand that before we can pass to the formula, "to each according to his needs," we shall have to pass through a number of stages of economic and cultural re-education of society, in the course of which work will be transformed in the eyes of society from only a means of supporting life into life's prime want, and social property into the sacred and inviolable basis of the existence of society.

In order to pave the way for a real, and not declaratory transition to communism, at least three main preliminary conditions have to be satisfied.

1. It is necessary, in the first place, to ensure, not a mythical "rational organization" of the productive forces, but a continuous expan-

sion of all social production, with a relatively higher rate of expansion of the production of means of production. The relatively higher rate of expansion of production of means of production is necessary not only because it has to provide the equipment both for its own plants and for all the other branches of the national economy, but also because reproduction on an extended scale becomes altogether impossible without it.

2. It is necessary, in the second place, by means of gradual transitions carried out to the advantage of the collective farms, and, hence, of all society, to raise collective farm property to the level of public property, and, also by means of gradual transitions, to replace commodity circulation by a system of products-exchange, under which the central government, or some other social-economic centre, might control the whole product of social production to the interests of society.

Comrade Yaroshenko is mistaken when he asserts that there is no contradiction between the relations of production and the productive forces of society under socialism. Of course, our present relations of production are in a period when they fully conform to the growth of the productive forces and help to advance them at seven-league strides. But it would be wrong to rest easy at that and to think that there are no contradictions between our productive forces and the relations of production. There certainly are, and will be, contradictions, seeing that the de-

velopment of the relations of production lags, and will lag, behind the development of the productive forces. Given a correct policy on the part of the directing bodies, these contradictions cannot grow into antagonisms, and there is no chance of matters coming to a conflict between the relations of production and the productive forces of society. It would be a different matter if we were to conduct a wrong policy, such as that which Comrade Yaroshenko recommends. In that case conflict would be inevitable, and our relations of production might become a serious brake on the further development of the productive forces.

The task of the directing bodies is therefore promptly to discern incipient contradictions, and to take timely measures to resolve them by adapting the relations of production to the growth of the productive forces. This, above all, concerns such economic factors as group, or collective farm, property and commodity circulation. At present, of course, these factors are being successfully utilized by us for the promotion of the socialist economy, and they are of undeniable benefit to our society. It is undeniable, too, that they will be of benefit also in the near future. But it would be unpardonable blindness not to see at the same time that these factors are already beginning to hamper the powerful development of our productive forces, since they create obstacles to the full extension of government planning to the whole of the national economy, especially agriculture. There is no

doubt that these factors will hamper the continued growth of the productive forces of our country more and more as time goes on. The task therefore is to eliminate these contradictions by gradually converting collective farm property into public property, and by introducing - also gradually - products-exchange in place of commodity circulation.

3. It is necessary, in the third place, to ensure such a cultural advancement of society as will secure for all members of society the all-round development of their physical and mental abilities, so that the members of society may be in a position to receive an education sufficient to enable them to be active agents of social development, and in a position freely to choose their occupations and not be tied all their lives, owing to the existing division of labour, to some one occupation.

What is required for this?

It would be wrong to think that such a substantial advance in the cultural standard of the members of society can be brought about without substantial changes in the present status of labour. For this, it is necessary, first of all, to shorten the working day at least to six, and subsequently to five hours. This is needed in order that the members of society might have the necessary free time to receive an all-round education. It is necessary, further, to introduce universal compulsory polytechnical education, which is required in order that the members of society might be freely able to choose their occupations

and not be tied to some one occupation all their lives. It is likewise necessary that housing conditions should be radically improved, and that real wages of workers and employees should be at least doubled, if not more, both by means of direct increases of wages and salaries, and, more especially, by further systematic reductions of prices for consumer goods.

These are the basic conditions required to pave the way for the transition to communism.

Only after all these preliminary conditions are satisfied in their entirety may it be hoped that work will be converted in the eyes of the members of society from a nuisance into "life's prime want" (Marx), that "labour will become a pleasure instead of a burden" (Engels), and that social property will be regarded by all members of society as the sacred and inviolable basis of the existence of society.

Only after all these preliminary conditions have been satisfied in their entirety will it be possible to pass from the socialist formula, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his work," to the communist formula, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

This will be a radical transition from one form of economy, the economy of socialism, to another, higher form of economy, the economy of communism.

As we see, the transition from socialism to communism is not such a simple matter as Comrade Yaroshenko imagines.

To attempt to reduce this complex and multiform process, which demands deep-going economic changes, to the "rational organization of the productive forces," as Comrade Yaroshenko does, is to substitute Bogdanovism for Marxism.

II

OTHER ERRORS OF COMRADE YAROSHENKO

1. From his incorrect opinion, Comrade Yaroshenko draws incorrect conclusions relative to the character and province of political economy.

Comrade Yaroshenko denies the necessity for a single political economy for all social formations, on the grounds that every social formation has its specific economic laws. But he is absolutely wrong there, and is at variance with such Marxists as Engels and Lenin.

Engels says that political economy is "the science of the conditions and forms under which the various human societies have produced and exchanged and on this basis have distributed their products." ("Anti-Dühring.") Hence, political economy investigates the laws of economic development not of any one social formation, but of the various social formations.

With this, as we know, Lenin was in full agreement. In his critical comments on Bukharin's "Economics of the Transition Period," he said that Bukharin was wrong in restricting the province of political economy to commodity pro-

duction, and above all to capitalist production, observing that in doing so Bukharin was taking "a step backward from Engels."

Fully in conformity with this is the definition of political economy given in the draft textbook, when it says that political economy is the science which studies "the laws of the social production and distribution of material values at the various stages of development of human society."

That is understandable. The various social formations are governed in their economic development not only by their own specific economic laws, but also by the economic laws that are common to all formations, such as, for instance, the law that the productive forces and the relations of production are united in one integral social production, and the law governing the relations between the productive forces and the relations of production in the process of development of all social formations. Hence, social formations are not only divided from one another by their own specific laws, but also connected with one another by the economic laws common to all formations.

Engels was quite right when he said:

"In order to carry out this critique of bourgeois economy completely, an acquaintance with the capitalist form of production, exchange and distribution did not suffice. The forms which had preceded it or those which still exist alongside it in less developed countries had also, at least in their main features, to be examined and

compared." ("Anti-Dühring.")

It is obvious that here, on this question, Comrade Yareoshenko is in tune with Bukharin.

Further, Comrade Yaroshenko declares that in his "Political Economy of Socialism," "the categories of political economy - value, commodity, money, credit, etc., - are replaced by a healthy discussion of the rational organization of the productive forces in social production," that, consequently, the subject of investigation of this political economy will not be the production relations of socialism, but "the elaboration and development of a scientific theory of the organization of the productive forces, theory of economic planning, etc.," and that, under socialism, the relations of production lose their independent significance and are absorbed by the productive forces as a component part of them.

It must be said that never before has any retrograde "Marxist" delivered himself of such unholy twaddle. Just imagine a political economy of socialism without economic, production problems! Does such a political economy exist anywhere in creation? What is the effect, in a political economy of socialism, of replacing economic problems by problems of organization of the productive forces? The effect is to abolish the political economy of socialism. And that is just what Comrade Yaroshenko does - he abolishes the political economy of socialism. In this, his position fully coincides with with that of Bukharin. Bukharin said that with the elimination of capitalism, political economy would also

be eliminated. Comrade Yaroshenko does not say this, but he does it; he does abolish the political economy of socialism. True, he pretends that he is not in full agreement with Bukharin; but that is only a trick, and a penny-ha'penny trick. In actual fact he is doing what Bukharin preached and what Lenin rose up in arms against. Comrade Yaroshenko is following in the footsteps of Bukharin.

Further, Comrade Yaroshenko reduces the problems of the political economy of socialism to problems of the rational organization of the productive forces, to problems of economic planning, etc. But he is profoundly in error. The rational organization of the productive forces, economic planning, etc., are not problems of political economy, but problems of the economic policy of the directing bodies. They are two different provinces, which must not be confused. Comrade Yaroshenko has confused these two different things, and has made a terrible mess of it. Political economy investigates the laws of development of man's relations of production. Economic policy draws practical conclusions from this, gives them concrete shape, and builds its day to day work on them. To foist upon political economy problems of economic policy is to kill it as a science.

The province of political economy is the production, the economic relations of men. It includes: a) the forms of ownership of the means of production; b) the status of the various social groups in production and their inter-

relations that follow from these forms, or what Marx calls: "mutual exchange of their activities"; c) the forms of distribution of products, which are entirely determined by them. All these together constitute the province of political economy.

This definition does not contain the word "exchange," which figures in Engels' definition. It is omitted because "exchange" is usually understood by many to mean the exchange of commodities, which is characteristic not of all, but only of some social formations, and this sometimes gives rise to misunderstanding, even though the word "exchange" with Engels did not mean only commodity exchange. As will be seen, however, that which Engels meant by the word "exchange" has been included, as a component part, in the above definition. Hence, this definition of the province of political economy fully coincides in content with Engels' definition.

2. When speaking of the basic economic law of some particular social formation, the presumption usually is that the latter cannot have several basic economic laws, that it can have only some one basic economic law, which precisely for that reason is the basic law. Otherwise we should have several basic economic laws for each social formation, which would be contrary to the very concept of a basic law. But Comrade Yaroshenko does not agree with this. He thinks that it is possible to have not one, but several basic economic laws of social-

ism. It is incredible, but a fact. At the Plenary Discussion, he said:

"The magnitudes and correlations of the material funds of social production and reproduction are determined by the available labour power engaged in social production and its prospective increase. This is the basic economic law of socialist society, and it determines the structure of socialist social production and reproduction."

That is one basic economic law of socialism.

In this same speech, Comrade Yaroshenko declared:

"In socialist society, the correlations be tween Departments I and II are determined by the fact that production must have means of production in quantities sufficient to enlist all the able-bodied members of the population in social production. This is the basic economic law of socialism, and it is at the same time a demand of our Constitution, following from the right to work enjoyed by Soviet citizens."

That, so to speak, is a second basic economic law of socialism.

Lastly, in his letter to the members of the Political Bureau, Comrade Yaroshenko declares:

"Accordingly, the essential features and requirements of the basic economic law of socialism may, it seems to me, be roughly formulated as follows: the continuous expansion and perfection of the production of the material and cultural conditions of the life of society."

Here we have a third basic economic law of socialism.

Whether all these laws are basic economic laws of socialism, or only one of them, and if only one of them, which exactly - to these questions Comrade Yaroshenko gives no answer in his last letter addressed to the members of the Political Bureau. When formulating the basic economic law of socialism in his letter to the members of the Political Bureau, he "forgot," it is to be presumed, that in his speech at the Plenary Discussion three months earlier he had already formulated two other basic economic laws of socialism, evidently believing that nobody would notice this dubious maneouvre, to say the least of it. But, as we see, he miscalculated.

Let us assume that the first two basic economic laws of socialism formulated by Comrade Yaroshenko no longer exist, and that from now on he regards as the basic economic law of socialism the third one, which he formulated in his letter to the members of the Political Bureau. Let us turn to this letter.

Comrade Yaroshenko says in this letter that he does not agree with the definition of the basic economic law of socialism which Comrade Stalin gave in his "Remarks." He says:

"The chief thing in this definition is "the securing of the maximum satisfaction of...the requirements of the whole of society." Production is presented here as the means of attaining this principal aim - satisfaction of requirements.

Such a definition furnishes grounds for assuming that the basic economic law of socialism formulated by you is based not on the primacy of production, but on the primacy of consumption."

It is evident that Comrade Yaroshenko has completely failed to understand the essence of the problem, and does not see that talk about the primacy of consumption or of production has absolutely nothing to do with the case. When speaking of the primacy of any social process over another, it is usually assumed that the two processes are more or less homogenous in character. One may, and should, speak of the primacy of the production of means of production over the production of means of consumption, because production is involved in both cases, and they are therefore more or less homogenous. But one cannot speak, and it would be wrong to speak, of the primacy of consumption over production, or of production over consumption, because production and consumption are two entirely different spheres, which, it is true, are connected with one another, but which are different spheres all the same. Comrade Yaroshenko obviously fails to realise that what we are speaking of here is not the primacy of consumption or of production, but of what aim society sets social production, to what purpose it subordinates social production - under socialism, say. So that when Comrade Yaroshenko says that "the basis of the life of socialist society, as of all other society, is production," it is entirely beside the point. Comrade Yaroshenko forgets

that men produce not for production's sake, but in order to satisfy their needs. He forgets that production divorced from the satisfaction of the needs of society withers and dies.

Can we speak in general of the aims of capitalist or socialist production, of the purposes to which capitalist or socialist production are subordinated? I think that we can and should.

Marx says:

"The direct aim of capitalist production is not the production of goods, but the production of surplus value or of profit in its developed form; not the product, but the surplus product. From this standpoint, labour itself is productive only in so far as it creates profit or surplus product for capital. In so far as the worker does not create it, his labour is unproductive. Consequently, the sum total of applied productive labour is of interest to capital only to the extent that through it - or in relation to it - the sum total of surplus labour increases. Only to that extent is what is called necessary labour time necessary. To the extent that it does not produce this result, it is superfluous and has to be discontinued.

"It is the constant aim of capitalist production to produce the maximum surplus value or surplus product with the minimum of capital advanced; in so far as this result is not attained by overworking the labourer, it is a tendency of capital to seek to produce a given product with the least expenditure - economizing labour power and costs...

"The labourers themselves figure in this conception as what they actually are in capitalist production - only means of production; not an aim in themselves and not the aim of production." ("Theory of Surplus Value," Vol. II, Part 2.)

These words of Marx are remarkable not only because they concisely and precisely define the aim of capitalist production, but also because they indicate the basic aim, the principal purpose, which socialist production should be set.

Hence, the aim of capitalist production is profit-making. As to consumption, capitalism needs it only in so far as it ensures the making of profit. Outside of this, consumption means nothing to capitalism. Man and his needs disappear from its field of vision.

What is the aim of socialist production? What is that main purpose to which social production should be subordinated under socialism?

The aim of socialist production is not profit, but man and his needs, that is, the satisfaction of his material and cultural requirements. As is stated in Comrade Stalin's "Remarks," the aim of socialist production is "the securing of the maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural requirements of the whole of society."

Comrade Yaroshenko thinks that what he is confronted with here is the "primacy" of consumption over production. That, of course, is a misapprehension. Actually, what we have here

is not the primacy of consumption, but the subordination of socialist production to its principal aim of securing the maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural requirements of the whole of society.

Consequently, maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural requirements of the whole of society is the aim of socialist production; continuous expansion and perfection of of socialist production on the basis of higher techniques is the means for the achievement of the aim.

Such is the basic economic law of socialism.

Desiring to preserve what he calls the "primacy" of production over consumption, Comrade Yaroshenko claims that the "basic economic law of socialism" consists in "the continuous expansion and perfection of the production of the material and cultural conditions of society." That is absolutely wrong. Comrade Yaroshenko grossly distorts and vitiates the formula given in Comrade Stalin's "Remarks." With him, production is converted from a means into an end, and the maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural requirements of society is thrown out. What we get is expansion of production for the sake of expansion of production, production as an aim in itself; man and his requirements disappear from Comrade Yaroshenko's field of vision.

It is therefore not surprising that, with the disappearance of man as the aim of social-

ist production, every vestige of Marxism disappears from Comrade Yaroshenko's "conception."

And so, what Comrade Yaroshenko arrives at is not the "primacy" of production over consumption, but something like the "primacy" of bourgeois ideology over Marxist ideology.

3. A question by itself is Marx's theory of reproduction. Comrade Yaroshenko asserts that the Marxian theory of reproduction is a theory of capitalist reproduction only, that it contains nothing that might have validity for other social formations, the socialist social formation in particular. He says:

"The extension of Marx's scheme of reproduction, which he elaborated for the capitalist economy, to socialist social production is the fruit of a dogmatic understanding of Marx's theory and runs counter to the essence of his theory." (Comrade Yaroshenko's speech at the Plenary Discussion.)

He further asserts: "Marx's scheme of reproduction does not correspond to the economic laws of socialist society and cannot serve as a basis in the investigation of socialist reproduction." (Ibid.)

Concerning Marx's theory of simple reproduction, which establishes a definite correlation between the production of means of production (Department I) and the production of means of consumption (Department II), Comrade Yaroshenko says:

"In socialist society, the correlation between Departments I and II is not determined

by Marx's formula v+m of Department I and c of Department II. There should be no such interconnection in development between Departments I and II under socialist conditions." (Ibid.)

He asserts: "The theory of the correlation between Departments I and II worked out by Marx is not applicable in our socialist conditions, since Marx's theory is based on capitalist economy and its laws." (Comrade Yaroshenko's letter to the members of the Political Bureau.)

That is how Comrade Yaroshenko makes mincemeat of Marx's theory of reproduction.

Of course, Marx's theory of reproduction, which was the fruit of an investigation of the laws of the capitalist mode of production, reflects the specific character of the latter, and, naturally, is clothed in the form of capitalist-commodity value relations. It could not have been otherwise. But he who sees in Marx's theory of reproduction only its form, and does not observe its fundamentals, its essential substance, which holds good not only for the capitalist social formation alone, has no understanding whatever of this theory. If Comrade Yaroshenko had any understanding at all of the matter, he would have realized the self-evident truth that Marx's scheme of reproduction does not begin and end with a reflection of the specific character of the capitalist mode of produc[illegible] that it at the same time contains a whole number of fundamental tenets on the subject of reproduction which hold good for all social form-

ations, particularly and especially for the socialist social formation. Such fundamental tenets of the Marxian theory of reproduction as the division of social production into the production of means of production and the production of means of consumption; the relatively greater increase of production of means of production in reproduction on an extended scale; the correlation between Departments I and II; surplus product as the sole source of accumulation; the formation and designation of the social funds; accumulation as the sole source of reproduction on an extended scale - all these fundamental tenets of the Marxian theory of reproduction are at the same time tenets which hold good not only for the capitalist formation, and which no socialist society can dispense with in the planning of its national economy. It is significant that Comrade Yaroshenko himself, who snorts so haughtily at Marx's "schemes of reproduction," is obliged every now and again to call in the help of these "schemes" when discussing problems of socialist reproduction.

And how did Lenin and Marx view the matter?

Everyone is familiar with Lenin's critical comments on Bukharin's "Economics of the Transition Period." In these remarks, as we know, Lenin recognized that Marx's formula of the correlations between Departments I and II, against which Comrade Yaroshenko rises in arms, holds true both for socialism and for "pure communism," that is, for the second phase of communism.

As to Marx, he, as we know, did not like to digress from his investigation of the laws of capitalist production, and did not in his "Capital," discuss the applicability of his schemes of reproduction to socialism. However, in Chapter XX, Vol. II of "Capital," in the section, "The Constant Capital of Department I," where he examines the exchange of Department I products within this department, Marx, as though in passing, observes that under socialism the exchange of products within this department would proceed with the same regularity as under the capitalist mode of production. He says:

"If production were socialized, instead of capitalistic, it is evident that these products of Department I would just as regularly be redistributed as means of production to the various lines of production of this department, for purposes of reproduction, one portion remaining directly in that sphere of production which created it, another passing over to other lines of production of the same department, thereby entertaining a constant mutual exchange between the various lines of production of this department." (Marx, "Capital," Vol.II, 8th Ed., p. 307.)

Consequently, Marx by no means considered that his theory of reproduction was valid only for the capitalist mode of production, although it was the laws of the capitalist mode of production he was investigating. We see, on the contrary, that he held that his theory of re-

production might be valid also for the socialist mode of production.

It should be remarked that, when analyzing the economics of socialism and of the transitional period to communism in his "Critique of the Gotha Program,". Marx proceeds from the fundamental tenets of his theory of reproduction, evidently regarding them as obligatory for the communist system.

It should also be remarked that when Engels, in his "Anti-Dühring," criticizes Dühring's "socialitarian system" and discusses the economics of the socialist system, he likewise proceeds from the fundamental tenets of Marx's theory of reproduction, regarding them as obligatory for the communist system.

Such are the facts.

It appears, then, that here too, in the question of reproduction, Comrade Yaroshenko, despite his sneering attitude towards Marx's "schemes," has again landed on the shoals.

4. Comrade Yaroshenko concludes his letter to the members of the Political Bureau with the proposal that the compilation of the "Political Economy of Socialism" be entrusted to him. He writes:

"On the basis of the definition of the province of the political-economic science of socialism outlined by me at the plenary meeting, in the working panel, and in the present letter, and utilizing the Marxian dialectical method, I could, with the help of two assistants, work out in the space of one year, or a year and a half

at most, the theoretical solution of the basic problems of the political economy of socialism, that is, expound the Marxist, Leninist-Stalinist theory of the political economy of socialism, a theory which would convert this science into an effective weapon of the struggle of the people for Communism."

It must be confessed that modesty is not one of Comrade Yaroshenko's failings - "even the other way round," it might be said, borrowing the style of some of our writers.

It has already been pointed out above that Comrade Yaroshenko confuses the political economy of socialism with the economic policy of the directing bodies. That which he considers the province of the political economy of socialism - rational organization of the productive forces, economic planning, formation of social funds, etc., - is the province of the economic policy of the directing bodies, and not of the political economy of socialism.

I say nothing of the fact that the serious blunders committed by Comrade Yaroshenko, and his un-Marxist "opinions" do not incline one to entrust him with such a task.

* * *

Conclusions:

1. The complaint Comrade Yaroshenko levels at the managers of the discussion is untenable, since they, being Marxists, could not in their summarizing documents, reflect his un-

Marxian "opinion";

2. Comrade Yaroshenko's request to be entrusted with the writing of the "Political Economy of Socialism" cannot be taken seriously, if only because it reeks of Khlestakovism.

J. STALIN

May 22, 1952.

REPLY TO COMRADES A.V. SANINA AND V.G. VENZHER

I have received your letters. It can be seen from them that their authors are making a profound and serious study of the economic problems of our country. There are quite a number of correct formulations and interesting arguments in the letters. But alongside of these, there are some grave theoretical errors. It is on these errors that I propose to dwell in this reply.

1. CHARACTER OF THE ECONOMIC LAWS OF SOCIALISM

Comrades Sanina and Venzher claim that "only because of the conscious action of the Soviet citizens engaged in material production do the economic laws of socialism arise." This opinion is absolutely incorrect.

Do the laws of economic development exist objectively, outside of us, independently of the will and consciousness of man? Marxism answers this question in the affirmative. Marxism holds that the laws of the political economy of socialism are a reflection in the minds of men of objective laws existing outside of us. But Comrades Sanina's and Venzher's formula answers this question in the negative. That means that these comrades are adopting the position of an incorrect theory which asserts that under socialism the laws of economic development are "created," "transformed" by the directing bodies of society. In other words, they are breaking with Marxism and taking the stand of subjective idealism.

Of course, men can discover these objective laws, come to know them and, relying upon them, utilize them in the interests of society. But they cannot "create" them, nor can they "transform" them.

Suppose for a moment that we accepted this incorrect theory which denies the existence of objective laws of economic activity under socialism, and which proclaims the possibility of "creating" and "transforming" economic laws. Where would it lead us? It would lead us into the realm of chaos and chance, we should find ourselves in slavish dependence on chances, and we should be forfeiting the possibility not only of understanding, but of simply finding our way about in this chaos of chances.

The effect would be that we should be destroying political economy as a science, because

science cannot exist and develop unless it recognizes the existence of objective laws, and studies them. And by destroying science, we should be forfeiting the possibility of foreseeing the course of developments in the economic life of the country, in other words, we should be forfeiting the possibility of providing even the most elementary economic leadership.

In the end we should find ourselves at the mercy of "economic" adventurers who are ready to "destroy" the laws of economic development and to "create" new laws without any understanding of, or consideration for objective law.

Everyone is familiar with the classic formulation of the Marxist position on this question given by Engels in his "Anti-Dühring":

"The forces operating in society work exactly like the forces operating in nature: blindly, violently, destructively, so long as we do not understand them and fail to take them into account. But when once we have come to know them and understand how they work, their direction and their effects, the gradual subjection of them to our will and the use of them for the attainment of our aims depend entirely upon ourselves. And this is especially true of the mighty productive forces of the present day. So long as we obstinately refuse to understand their nature and their character - and the capitalist mode of production and its defenders set themselves against any such attempt - these forces operate in spite of us, against us, dominate us, as we have shown in detail. But once their

nature is grasped, in the hands of the producers working in association they can be transformed from demoniacal masters into willing servants. This is the difference between the destructive forces of electricity in the lightning of a thunderstorm and the tamed electricity of the telegraph and the arc light; the difference between a conflagration and fire in the service of man. Such treatment of today's productive forces in accordance with their nature, now becomes known at last, opens the way to the replacement of the anarchy of social production by a socially planned regulation of production in accordance with the needs both of society as a whole and of each individual. The capitalist mode of appropriation, in which the product enslaves first the producer, and then also the appropriator, will thereby be replaced by the mode of appropriation of the product based on the nature of the modern means of production themselves: on the one hand direct social appropriation as a means to the maintenance and extension of production, and on the other hand direct individual appropriation as a means to life and pleasure."

2. MEASURES FOR EVALUATING COLLECTIVE FARM PROPERTY TO THE LEVEL OF PUBLIC PROPERTY

What measures are necessary to raise collective farm property, which, of course, is not public property, to the level of public ("nation-

al") property?

Some comrades think that the thing to do is simply to nationalize collective farm property, to proclaim it public property, in the way that was done in the past in the case of capitalist property. Such a proposal would be absolutely wrong and quite unacceptable. Collective farm property is socialist property, and we simply cannot treat it in the same way as capitalist property. From the fact that collective farm property is not public property, it by no means follows that it is not socialist property.

These comrades believe that the conversion of the property of individuals or groups of individuals into state property is the only, or at any rate the best, form of nationalization. That is not true. The fact is that conversion into state property is not the only, or even the best, form of nationalization, but the initial form of nationalization, as Engels quite rightly says in "Anti-Dühring." Unquestionably, so long as the state exists, conversion into state property is the most natural initial form of nationalization. But the state will not exist forever. With the extension of the sphere of operation of socialism in the majority of the countries of the world the state will die away, and, of course, the conversion of the property of individuals or groups of individuals into state property will consequently lose its meaning. The state will have died away, but society will remain. Hence, the heir of the public property will then be not the state, which will have died away, but society it-

self, in the shape of a central, directing economic body.

That being so, what must be done to raise collective farm property to the level of public property?

The proposals made by Comrades Sanina and Venzher as the chief means of achieving such an elevation of collective farm property is to sell the basic implements of production concentrated in the Machine and Tractor Stations to the collective farms as their property, thus releasing the state from the necessity of making capital investments in agriculture, and to make the collective farms themselves responsible for the maintenance and development of the machine and tractor stations. They say:

"It is wrong to believe that collective farm investments must be used chiefly for the cultural needs of the collective farm village, while the greater bulk of the investments for the needs of agricultural production must continue as hitherto to be borne by the state. Would it not be more correct to relieve the state of this burden, seeing that the collective farms are capable of taking it entirely upon themselves? The state will have plenty of undertakings in which to invest its funds with a view to creating an abundance of articles of consumption in the country."

The authors advance several arguments in support of their proposal.

First. Referring to Stalin's statement that means of production are not sold even to the

collective farms, the authors of the proposal cast doubt on this statement of Stalin's by declaring that the state, after all, does sell means of production to the collective farms, such as minor implements, like scythes and sickles, small power engines, etc. They consider that if the state can sell such means of production to the collective farms, it might also sell them other means of production, such as the machines of the MTS.

This argument is untenable. The state, of course, does sell minor implements to the collective farms, as, indeed, it has to in compliance with the Rules of the Agricultural Artel and the Constitution. But can we lump in one category minor implements and such basic agricultural means of production as the machines of the MTS's, or, let us say, the land, which, after all, is also one of the basic means of production in agriculture? Obviously not. They cannot be lumped in one category because minor implements do not in any degree decide the fate of collective farm production, whereas such means of production as the machines of the MTS's and the land entirely decide the fate of agriculture in our present-day conditions.

It should not be difficult to understand that when Stalin said that means of production are not sold to the collective farms, it was not minor implements he had in mind, but the basic means of agricultural production: the machines of the MTS's, the land. The authors are playing with the words "means of production" and are

confusing two different things, without observing that they are getting into a mess.

Second. Comrades Sanina and Venzher further refer to the fact that in the early period of the mass collective farm movement - end of 1929 and beginning of 1930 - the C.C., C.P.S.-U. (B.) was itself in favour of transferring the machine and tractor stations to the collective farms as their property, requiring them to pay off the cost of the MTS's over a period of three years. They consider that although nothing came of this at the time, "in view of the poverty" of the collective farms, now that they have become wealthy it might be expedient to return to this policy, namely, the sale of the MTS's to the collective farms.

This argument is likewise untenable. A decision really was adopted by the C.C., C.P.S.-U. (B.) in the early part of 1930 to sell the MTS's to the collective farms. It was adopted at the suggestion of a group of collective farm shock workers as an experiment, as a trial, with the idea of reverting to the question at an early date and re-examining it. But the first trial demonstrated the inadvisability of this decision, and a few months later, namely, at the close of 1930, it was rescinded.

The susequent spread of the collective farm movement and the development of collective farm construction definitely convinced both the collective farmers and the leading officials that concentration of the basic implements of agricultural production in the hands

of the state, in the hands of the machine and tractor stations, was the only way of ensuring a high rate of expansion of collective farm production.

We are all gratified by the tremendous strides agricultural production in our country is making, by the increasing output of grain, cotton, flax, sugar beet, etc. What is the source of this increase? It is the increase of up-to-date technical equipment, the numerous up-to-date machines which are serving all branches of production. It is not a question of machinery generally; the question is that machinery cannot remain at a standstill, it must be perfected all the time, old machinery being scrapped and replaced by new, and the new by newer still. Without this, the onward march of our socialist agriculture would be impossible; big harvests and an abundance of agricultural produce would be out of the question. But what is involved in scrapping hundreds of thousands of wheel tractors and replacing them by caterpillar tractors, in replacing tens of thousands of obsolete harvester-combines by more up-to-date ones, in creating new machines, say, for industrial crops? It involves an expenditure of billions of rubles which can be recouped only after the lapse of six or eight years. Are our collective farms capable of bearing such an expense, even though their incomes may run into the millions? No, they are not, since they are not in the position to undertake the expenditure of billions of rubles which may be recouped only after a period of six to

eight years. Such expenditures can be borne only by the state, for it, and it alone, is in the position to bear the loss involved by the scrapping of old machines and replacing them by new; because it, and it alone, is in a position to bear such losses for six or eight years and only then recover the outlays.

What, in view of this, would be the effect of selling the MTS's to the collective farms as their property? The effect would be to involve the collective farms in heavy loss and to ruin them, to undermine the mechanization of agriculture, and to slow up the development of collective farm production.

The conclusion therefore is that, in proposing that the the MTS's should be sold to the collective farms as their property, Comrades Sanina and Venzher are suggesting a step in reversion to the old backwardness and are trying to turn back the wheel of history.

Assuming for a moment that we accepted Comrades Sanina's and Venzher's proposal and began to sell the basic implements of production, the machine and tractor stations, to the collective farms as their property. What would be the outcome?

The outcome would be, first, that the collective farms would become the owners of the basic instruments of production; that is, their status would be an exceptional one, such as is not shared by any other enterprise in our country, for, as we know, even the nationalized enterprises do not own their instruments of pro-

duction. How, by what considerations of progress and advancement, could this exceptional status of the collective farms be justified? Can it be said that such a status would facilitate the elevation of collective farm property to the level of public property, that it would expedite the transition of our society from socialism to communism? Would it not be truer to say that such a status could only dig a deeper gulf between collective farm property and public property, and would not bring us any nearer to communism, but, on the contrary, remove us farther from it?

The outcome would be, secondly, an extension of the sphere of operation of commodity circulation, because a gigantic quantity of instruments of agricultural production would come within its orbit. What do Comrades Sanina and Venzher think - is the extension of the sphere of commodity circulation calculated to promote our advance towards communism? Would it not be truer to say that our advance towards communism would only be retarded by it?

Comrades Sanina's and Venzher's basic error lies in the fact that they do not understand the role and significance of commodity circulation under socialism; that they do not understand that commodity circulation is incompatible with the prospective transition from socialism to communism. They evidently think that the transition from socialism to communism is possible even with commodity circulation, that commodity circulation can be no obstacle to this.

That is a profound error, arising from an inadequate grasp of Marxism.

Criticizing Dühring's "economic commune," which functions in the conditions of commodity circulation, Engels, in his "Anti-Dühring," convincingly shows that the existence of commodity circulation was inevitably bound to lead Dühring's so-called "economic communes" to the regeneration of capitalism. Comrades Sanina and Venzher evidently do not agree with this. All the worse for them. But we, Marxists, adhere to the Marxist view that the transition from socialism to communism and the communist principle of distribution of products according to needs preclude all commodity exchange, and, hence, preclude the conversion of products into commodities, and, with it, their conversion into value.

So much for the proposal and arguments of Comrades Sanina and Venzher.

But what, then, should be done to elevate collective farm property to the level of public property?

The collective farm is an unusual kind of enterprise. It operates on land, and cultivates land which has long been public, and not collective farm property. Consequently, the collective farm is not the owner of the land it cultivates.

Further, the collective farm operates with basic implements of production which are public, not collective farm property. Consequently, the collective farm is not the owner of its basic im-

plements of production.

Further, the collective farm is a co-operative enterprise: it utilizes the labour of its members, and it distributes its income among its members on the basis of workday units; it owns its seed, which is renewed every year and goes into production.

What, then, does the collective farm own? Where is the collective farm property which it disposes of quite freely, at its own discretion? This property of the collective farm is its product, the product of collective farming: grain, meat, butter, vegetables, cotton, sugar beet, flax, etc., not counting the buildings and the personal husbandry of the collective farmers on their household plots. The fact is that a considerable part of this product, the surplus collective farm output, goes into the market and is thus included in the system of commodity circulation. It is precisely this circumstance which now prevents the elevation of collective farm property to the level of public property. It is therefore precisely from this end that the work of elevating collective farm property to the level of public property must be tackled.

In order to raise collective farm property to the level of public property, the surplus collective farm output must be excluded from the system of commodity circulation and included in the system of products-exchange between state industry and the collective farms. That is the point.

We still have no developed system of pro-

ducts-exchange, but the rudiments of such a system exist in the shape of the "merchandising" of agricultural products. For quite a long time already, as we know, the products of the cotton-growing, flax-growing, beet-growing and other collective farms are "merchandised." They are not "merchandised" in full, it is true, but only partly, still they are "merchandised." Be it mentioned in passing that "merchandising" is not a happy word, and should be replaced by "products-exchange." The task is to extend these rudiments of products-exchange to all branches of agriculture and to develop them into a broad system, under which the collective farms would receive for their products not only money, but also and chiefly the manufactures they need. Such a system would require an immense increase in the goods allocated by the town to the country, and it would therefore have to be introduced without any particular hurry, and only as the products of the town multiply. But it must be introduced unswervingly and unhesitatingly, step by step contracting the sphere of operation of commodity circulation and widening the sphere of operation of products-exchange.

Such a system, by contracting the sphere of operation of commodity circulation, will facilitate the transition from socialism to communism. Moreover, it will make it possible to include the basic property of the collective farms, the product of collective farming, in the general system of national planning.

That will be a real and effective means of

raising collective farm property to the level of public property under our present-day conditions.

Will such a system be advantageous to the collective farm peasantry? It undoubtedly will. It will, because the collective farm peasantry will receive far more products from the state than under commodity circulation, and at much cheaper prices. Everyone knows that the collective farms which have products-exchange ("merchandising") contracts with the government receive incomparably greater advantages than the collective farms which have no such contracts. If the products-exchange system is extended to all the collective farms in the country, these advantages will become available to all our collective farm peasantry.

J. STALIN

September 28, 1952.

(Foreign Languages Publishing House," Moscow 1952)

TELEGRAM TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE RUMANIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC, PETRU GROZA

On the occasion of the fourth anniversary of the signing of the Soviet-Rumanian Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Support

February 1952

To the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Rumanian People's Republic, Petru Groza.

On the fourth anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Support between the Soviet Union and the Rumanian People's Republic, I send you, Comrade Chairman, the government of the Rumanian People's Republic and the Rumanian people, my congratulations.

J. STALIN

("New Way," - Organ of the German Anti-fascist Committee in the Rumanian People's Republic, No. 884, 5 February, 1952)

TELEGRAM TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CENTRAL PEOPLE'S GOVERNMENT OF THE CHINESE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC, MAO TSE TUNG

On the occasion of the second anniversary of the signing of the Soviet-Chinese Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Support

"Pravda," 14 February, 1952

To the Chairman of the Central People's Government of the Chinese People's Republic, Comrade Mao Tse Tung.

On the occasion of the second anniversary of the signing of the Soviet-Chinese Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Support, please accept, Comrade Chairman, my sincere congratulations and wishes for the further strengthening of the alliance and cooperation between the Chinese People's Republic and the Soviet Union, in the interests of world peace.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 39, 15 February, 1952)

ANSWERS TO FOUR QUESTIONS FROM A GROUP OF EDITORS OF AMERICAN NEWSPAPERS

31 March, 1952

Q. Is a third world war presently as near as two or three years away?

A. No, it is not.

Q. Would a meeting of heads of state of the great powers be useful?

A. Possibly, it would be useful.

Q. Are you of the opinion that the present times are appropriate for Germany's unification?

A. Yes, I am of that opinion.

Q. On what basis is it possible for capitalism and communism to live side by side?

A. It is possible for capitalism and communism to live side by side if both sides wish to co-operate and the readiness to do so exists, to fulfil the duties they have taken on themselves, if its basis is complete equality and non-interference in the internal affairs of other states.

("Unity," 5 May, 1952, P. 417)

TELEGRAM TO THE MINISTER PRESIDENT OF THE HUNGARIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC ISTVAN DOBI

On the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the liberation of Hungary by the Soviet army

April 1952

I ask the government of the People's Republic of Hungary and you, Comrade Minister President, to accept my sincere congratulations on the occasion of your national day of celebration. I wish the Hungarian people further success in the building of a new, free Hungary.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 82, 5 April, 1952)

TELEGRAM TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF POLAND BOLESLAW BIERUT

On the occasion of his 60th Birthday

18 April, 1952

To the President of the Republic of Poland, Comrade Boleslaw Bierut.

Permit me to greet you on your 60th birthday, Comrade President, as the great builder and leader of a new, united, independent, Po-

lish people's democracy.

I wish you good health and success in your labour for the well-being of the fraternal Polish people and in the further strengthening of the friendship between the Polish Republic and the Soviet Union, in the interests of world peace.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 93, 20 April, 1952)

TELEGRAM TO THE MINISTER PRESIDENT OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF POLAND JOSEF CYRANKIEWICZ

On the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the Soviet-Polish Treaty of Friendship

April 1952

I ask the government of the Polish Republic and you, Comrade Minister President, on the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the signing of the Soviet-Polish Treaty of Friendship, Mutual Help and Cooperation after the war, to accept my greetings and sincere wishes for your future success.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 95, 23 April, 1952)

TELEGRAM TO THE MINISTER PRESIDENT OF THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OTTO GROTEWOHL

On the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the liberation of the German people from the fascist tyranny

8 May, 1952

To the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic, Comrade Otto Grotewohl.

I ask the government of the German Democratic Republic and you personally, Comrade Minister President, to accept my thanks for your friendly greetings on the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the liberation of the German people from the fascist tyranny.

I wish the German people and the government of the German Democratic Republic, success in the struggle for an united, independent, democratic and peace-loving Germany, for the immediate conclusion of a peace treaty and the departure of the occupying forces from Germany in the interests of Germany and of world peace.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 109, 9 May, 1952)

TELEGRAM TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE RUMANIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC, PETRU GROZA, AND THE GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE RUMANIAN WORKERS' PARTY, GHEORGIU-DEJ

On the occasion of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the proclamation of an independent Rumanian state

"Pravda," 10 May, 1952

To the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Rumanian People's Republic, Comrade Petru Groza, and the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Rumanian Workers' Party, Comrade Gheorgiu-Dej.

I ask the government of the Rumanian People's Republic, the Central Committee of the Rumanian Workers' Party and you personally to accept my thanks for your friendly greetings on the occasion of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the proclamation of an independent Rumanian state.

I wish the Rumanian people, the government of the People's Republic of Rumania and the Central Committee of the Rumanian Workers' Party, further success in the building of a new, free Rumanian people's democracy.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 111, 11 May, 1952)

TELEGRAM TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE CZECHOSLOVAKIAN REPUBLIC, ANTONIN ZAPOTOCKY

On the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the liberation of the Czechoslovakian Republic by the Soviet army

"Pravda," 10 May, 1952

To the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Czechoslovakian Republic, Comrade Antonin Zapotocky.

On the occasion of the Czechoslovakian national day of celebration, - the seventh anniversary of the liberation from the Hitler occupation, - please accept, Comrade Chairman, my friendly congratulations and wishes for the future success of the Czechoslovakian people in the building of a new Czechoslovakian people's democracy.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 111, 11 May, 1952)

GREETINGS LETTER TO THE YOUNG PIONEERS OF THE SOVIET UNION

On the occasion of thirty years of existence of the V.I. Lenin Pioneer Organization of the Soviet Union

"Pravda," 20 May, 1952

To the Young Pioneers of the Soviet Union.

I wholeheartedly greet the Young Pioneers and pupils on the thirty years of existence of the V.I. Lenin Pioneer Organization.

I wish the Pioneers and pupils health and success in their studies, in their work and in their social endeavours.

May the Pioneer Organization continue in the future to educate the Pioneers and become true sons of Lenin and our great Motherland.

J. STALIN

("Pravda," 20 May, 1952)

GREETINGS LETTER TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CENTRAL PEOPLE'S GOVERNMENT OF THE CHINESE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC MAO TSE TUNG

On the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the Chinese People's Liberation Army

1 August, 1952

Comrade Chairman, please accept my sincere greetings on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the Chinese People's Liberation Army of the People's Republic of China. In the interests of peace and security, I wish the further strengthening of the Chinese People's Army.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 179, 1 August, 1952)

GREETINGS TELEGRAM TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CABINET OF MINISTERS OF THE KOREAN PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC KIM IR SEN

On the occasion of the national day of celebration of the Korean People's Democratic Republic

15 August, 1952

To the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Korean People's Democratic Republic, Kim Ir Sen.

Please accept, Comrade Chairman, on the national day of celebration of the Korean People's Democratic Republic, my sincere congratulations, together with the wish for the further success of the Korean people in their struggle for the freedom and independence of their homeland.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 192, 16 August, 1952)

DECISION OF THE C.C. OF THE C.P.S.U.(B.) TO CALL THE 19TH PARTY CONGRESS OF THE C.P.S.U.(B.) ON 5 OCTOBER, 1952

On Wednesday, 20 August, 1952, "Pravda" published the following message:

To all Organizations of the C.P.S.U.(B.):

Today in Moscow there was a Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.). The Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.) has decided to call the 19th Party Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.) on 5 October, 1952.

Agenda for the 19th Party Congress:

I. Report of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.). Report to be given by Comrade Malenkov.

II. Report of the Central Revision Commission of the C.P.S.U.(B.). Report to be given by the Chairman of the Revision Commission, Comrade Moskatov.

III. Guidelines of the 19th Party Congress for the fifth Five-Year Plan for the development of the U.S.S.R. in the years 1951 - 1955. Report to be given by the Chairman of the State Planning Commission, Comrade Saburov.

IV. Alterations in the Statutes of the C.P.S.U.(B.). Report to be given by the Secretary of the Central Committee, Comrade Krushchev.

V. Elections to the Central Party Organs.

Rules for the procedure of election of delegates to the Party Congress:

1. One delegate with a deciding vote for every 5000 Party members.

2. One delegate with an advisory vote for every 5000 Party candidates.

3. That delegates to the 19th Party Congress in agreement with the Party statutes, are elected by secret ballot.

4. The Party Organizations of the Russian, Socialist, Federative, Soviet Republics to elect delegates to the Party Congress from areas, provinces and autonomous Republics. In the remaining Soviet Republics, the delegates to be elected on the judgement of the Communist Parties of the Union Republics at regional conferences, or on Party Congresses of the Communist Parties of the Union Republics.

5. The Communists in the Party Organizations of the Soviet Army, Navy and the Border Units of the Ministry of State Security to elect their delegates to the 19th Party Congress with the rest of the Party Organizations of the areas, - respectively - district Party conferences or at the Party Congresses of the Communist Parties of the Union Republics.

J. STALIN
Secretary of the C.C., C.P.S.U.(B).

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 196, 21 August, 1952)

TELEGRAM TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE RUMANIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC, GHEORGIU-DEJ

On the occasion of the eighth anniversary of the liberation of Rumania from the fascist yoke

23 August, 1952

To the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Rumanian People's Republic, Comrade Gheorgiu-Dej.

On the occasion of the national day of celebration, - Liberation Day, - please accept, Comrade Chairman, and the government of the Rumanian People's Republic, my sincere congratulations and friendly wishes for new success of the Rumanian people in the building of a Rumanian people's democracy.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 199, 24 August, 1952)

ANSWERING TELEGRAM TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CENTRAL PEOPLE'S GOVERNMENT THE CHINESE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC MAO TSE TUNG

On the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the victory over Japanese imperialism

2 September, 1952

To the Chairman of the Central People's Government of the Chinese People's Republic, Comrade Mao Tse Tung.

Please accept, Comrade Chairman, my thanks for the expression of your feelings on the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the victory over Japanese imperialism by the Soviet people and the Soviet Army.

In this historic victory, the Chinese people and their People's Liberation Army played a great role by their heroism and sacrifices in the smashing of Japanese aggression.

The great friendship between the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic is a sure guarantee against the danger of a new aggression, a mighty bulwark of peace in the far East and in the whole world.

Please accept, Comrade Chairman, on the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the liberation of the Chinese people from the yoke of Japanese imperialism, the good wishes of the Soviet Union.

Long live the unbreakable friendship between the Chinese People's Republic and the Soviet Union!

Long live the People's Liberation Army of the Chinese People's Republic!

J. STALIN
Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R.

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 208, 4 September, 1952)

TELEGRAM TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF BULGARIA WYLKO TSHERVENKOV

On the occasion of the eighth anniversary of the liberation of Bulgaria

9 September, 1952

To the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Comrade Wylko Tshervenkov.

On the national day of celebration of the Bulgarian People's Republic, please accept, Comrade Chairman, my sincere greetings and wishes for the further success of the fraternal Bulgarian people in the building of a new Bulgarian people's democracy.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 213, 10 September, 1952)

TELEGRAM TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CENTRAL PEOPLE'S GOVERNMENT OF THE CHINESE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC, MAO TSE TUNG

On the occasion of the third anniversary of the proclamation of the Chinese People's Republic

1 October, 1952

To the Chairman of the Central People's Government of the Chinese People's Republic, Comrade Mao Tse Tung.

Please accept, Comrade Chairman, my sincere congratulations on the occasion of the third anniversary of the proclamation of the Chinese People's Republic.

I wish the great Chinese people, the government of the Chinese People's Republic and you personally, new success in the building of a mighty, people's democratic Chinese state.

May the great friendship between the Chinese People' Republic and the U.S.S.R., the firm bulwark of peace and security in the far East and in the whole world, thrive and grow stronger.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 231, 1 October, 1952)

TELEGRAM TO THE MINISTER PRESIDENT OF THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OTTO GROTEWOHL

On the occasion of the third anniversary of the founding of the German Democratic Republic

7 October, 1952

To the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic, Comrade Otto Grotewohl.

On the occasion of the national day of celebration, - the third anniversary of the founding of the German Democratic Republic, - I send the German people, the government and you personally, Comrade Minister President, my congratulations. Please accept my wishes for further success in the great work of creating an united, independent, democratic, peace-loving Germany.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 236, 7 October, 1952)

TELEGRAM TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CABINET OF MINISTERS OF THE KOREAN PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC KIM IR SEN

On the occasion of the fourth anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the U.S.S.R. and the Korean People's Democratic Republic.

October 1952

To the Chairman of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Korean People's Democratic Republic, Comrade Kim Ir Sen.

Comrade Chairman, please accept the thanks of the Soviet government and myself for your friendly congratulations and good wishes on the occasion of the fourth anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Korean People's Democratic Republic and the U.S.S.R.

I wish the Korean people, who courageously defend their national rights, success in their struggle for the freedom and independence of their homeland.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," No. 41, 13 October, 1952)

SPEECH AT THE 19TH PARTY CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION

14 October, 1952

Comrades!

Permit me, in the name of our Party Congress, to express our thanks to all fraternal parties and organizations whose representatives have honoured our Party Congress by their presence, or who have sent our Party Congress greetings of friendship, for their wishes for our further success and for their confidence. (Stormy, prolonged applause that became an ovation.)

For us, this trust is especially valuable as it signifies their readiness to support our Party in its struggle for a better future for the people, in its struggle against war, in its struggle to keep peace. (Stormy, prolonged applause.)

It would be a mistake to believe that our Party, which has become a mighty power, does not need more support. That would be wrong. Our Party and our country need the continuous trust, sympathy and support of fraternal peoples outside our borders, and will always need it.

The special quality of this support lies in that every support of the peace endeavours of our Party by each fraternal party, simultaneously signifies the support of their own people in their struggle to keep peace. As the English workers in the years 1918-1919, during the armed attack of the English bourgeoisie on the Soviet Union, organized their struggle against the war under the slogan "Hands off Russia!", was a support, it was above all a support of the struggle of their own people for peace, and then, also, a support of the Soviet Union. If Comrade Thorez or Comrade Togliatti declare that their people do not want to be led into a war against the people of the Soviet Union, (stormy applause), - then that is a support, above all a support for the French and Italian workers and peasants who struggle for peace, and then, also, a support of the peace endeavours of the Soviet Union. The special quality of the present support is thus explained, that the interests of our Party are not only not against the interests of the peace-loving people, but on the contrary, blend with them. (Stormy applause.) Where the Soviet Union is concerned, its interest in the matter of world peace cannot be seperated from the cause of peace in the whole world.

It is understood that our Party must do its duty by its fraternal parties and support them and their peoples in the struggle for liberation and in their struggle for keeping peace. This is what the Party does. (Stormy applause.) After the seizure of power by our Party in 1917, and after our Party took real measures to eliminate the yoke of capitalists and landlords, the representatives of the fraternal parties, inspired by our daring and the success of our Party, gave it the name "Shock Brigade" of the revolutionary movement and the workers' movement of

the world. Thereby they expressed the hope that the success of the "Shock Brigade" would alleviate the sufferings of the people in the situation of being under the capitalist yoke. I think that our Party has fulfilled these hopes, especially in the time of the second world war, as the Soviet Union smashed the German and Japanese fascist tyranny and liberated the European and Asian peoples from the danger of fascist slavery. (Stormy applause.)

Of course it was very difficult to fulfil this honourable task as long as there was only one "Shock Brigade," as long as it stood alone, the avant-garde in the fulfilment of this task. But that is in the past. Now it is completely different. Now, from China and Korea to Czechoslovakia and Hungary, new "Shock Brigades" have appeared on the map, in the form of people's democracies; now the struggle has been eased for our Party and also the work proceeds better. (Stormy, prolonged applause.)

Special attention must be paid to the communist, democratic or worker and peasant parties that are not yet in power and which must carry out their work under the yoke of strict, bourgeois rule. Of course their work is more difficult. But their work is not so difficult as it was for us Russian Communists in the time of the Tsar, as the smallest step forward was declared a serious crime. The Russian Communists nevertheless held firm, did not retreat from difficulties and came to victory. The same will be the case with these parties.

Why is it that these parties do not have such difficult work as the Russian Communists had in the times of Tsarism?

Because, first of all, they have the example of the struggle and success, as in the Soviet Union and in the people's democratic countries, before them. Consequently, they can learn from the mistakes and successes of these countries and thus ease their work.

Because, secondly, the bourgeoisie itself, the arch-enemy of the freedom movement, has become different, has essentially changed, has become more reactionary, has lost the cooperation of the people and thus has been weakened. It is understood that these circumstances must likewise ease the work of the revolutionary and democratic parties. (Stormy applause.)

Earlier, the bourgeoisie presented themselves as liberal, they were for bourgeois democratic freedom and in that way gained popularity with the people. Now there is not one remaining trace of liberalism. There is no such thing as "freedom of personality" any more, - personal rights are now only acknowledged by them, the owners of capital, - all the other citizens are regarded as raw materials, that are only for exploitation. The principle of equal rights for people and nations is trodden in the dust and it is replaced by the principle of full rights for the exploiting minority and the lack of rights of the exploited majority of the citizens. The banner of bourgeois democratic freedom has been flung overboard. I think that you,

the representatives of communist and democratic parties must pick up this banner and carry it forward if you want to gain the majority of the people. There is nobody else to raise it. (Stormy applause.)

Earlier, the bourgeoisie, as the heads of nations, were for the rights and independence of nations and put that "above all." Now there is no trace left of this "national principle." Now the bourgeoisie sell the rights and independence of their nations for dollars. The banner of national independence and national sovereignty has been thrown overboard. Without doubt, you, the representatives of the communist and democratic parties must raise this banner and carry it forward if you want to be patriots of your countries, if you want to be the leading powers of the nations. There is nobody else to raise it. (Stormy applause.)

That is how matters stand at present.

It is understood that all these circumstances must ease the work of the communist and democratic parties that are not yet in power.

Consequently, there is every ground for the success and victory of the fraternal parties in the lands of capitalist rule. (Stormy applause.)

Long live our fraternal parties! (Prolonged applause.)

Long life and health to the leaders of the fraternal parties! (Prolonged applause.)

Long live the peace between the peoples!

(Prolonged applause.)

Down with the arsonists of war! (Everyone stood up. Stormy, prolonged applause that became an ovation. There were shouts of "Long live Comrade Stalin!" "Long live the great leader of the working people of the world, Comrade Stalin!" "The great Stalin!" "Long live peace between the peoples!")

(Speech at the 19th Party Congress of the C.P.S.U., Dietz Press, Berlin 1952, Pp. 5 - 15)

